DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 816 HE 021 689

AUTHOR	Koehler, Lyle
TITLE	Urban Higher Education and Services: The Creation and Demise of an Idea, 1865-1930.
PUB DATE	[78]
NOTE	122p.
PUB TYPE	Historical Materials (060)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; Administrator Role; Community Change; Community Services; Educational History; Equal Education; Higher Education; Institutional Survival; Modernization; *Professional Services; *Public Service; *Social Change; Social Influences; *Urban Universities

ABSTRACT

The history of the idea of service at municipally-controlled institutions of higher education from the 19th century through 1930 is presented. Currently, as Americans are pursuing a search for their roots, many social institutions are focussing attention on building a viable sense of community, on inclusion and a more all-encompassing sense of vitality. This includes the educational system, and in particular those universities which have had an active, albeit constantly changing, history of involvement with the municipalities in which they are centered. The word "service" has taken on a variety of definitions and dimensions. Therefore, it seems appropriate for educators to begin to search for their own service-centered roots to let the past invigorate and help define the present. An effort to tie intellectual attitudes to social change and to illustrate how educators at American colleges and universities viewed service and change is made. The increasing accessibility of higher education to previously excluded groups is explicated. The essay's three chapters examine respectively: (1) nineteenth century patterns; (2) progressive search for unity, 1900-1917; and (3) fragmentation and isolation, 1917-1930. Contains 140 references. (SM)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED298816

URBAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND SERVICE: THE CREATION AND DEMISE OF AN IDEA, 1865-1930

By

Lyle Koehler
ERIC/CRESS
New Mexico State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

LYLE P. KOEHLER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

HE 021 689

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction..i

2. Chapter I: Nineteenth Century Patterns..........................1

3. Chapter II: Progressives Search for Unity, 1900-1917...........28

4. Chapter III: Fragmentation and Isolation, 1917-1930............75

5. Bibliography..106

Introduction

It has almost become proverbial to say that we are living in a time when Americans are pursuing, with relentless vigor, a search for their roots, their fixity in a changing world. As the desire for unity and stability serves to heal the traumas of past decades, a great number of our social institutions have chosen to focus considerable attention on building a viable sense of community, on inclusion and a more all-encompassing sense of vitality. Not the least of these institutions is the educational system, and in particular those universities which have had an active, albeit constantly changing, history of involvement with the municipalities in which they are centered. The oft-repeated word Service has taken on a variety of definitions and dimensions. To make good sense out of this idea, it appears only appropriate that we as educators begin to search for our own service-centered roots, for the past not only invigorates the present but helps to define it a little more clearly.

The following essay traces the history of the idea of service at municipally-controlled institutions of higher education from the nineteenth century through 1930. It makes an effort to tie intellectual attitudes to social change and to illustrate how educators at American colleges and universities viewed service and change. It also explicates the increasing accessibility of higher education to previously excluded groups--be they Blacks, women, other minority groups, or the poor. Service is a multifaceted concept, and this work strives to clarify its many dimensions in such a way that it can serve as a background against which the contemporary experience can be weighed and measured.

CHAPTER I: NINETEENTH CENTURY PATTERNS

Nineteenth century Americans exhibited an almost ceaseless zeal for expansion--a zeal tied closely to events occurring in the booming metropolis. Geographically, the manifest destiny of the 1840s gave way to more local efforts to annex the urban hinterland by the end of the century. Economically, the value of agricultural output increased by 127% between 1860 and 1900, while the value of manufactured produce shot upward by 511% and industrial capitalization by 789%. The number of manufacturing establishments grew from 140,000 in 1860 to a modest 208,000 in 1900, but the number of people employed in such plants more than quadrupled--from one to 4.7 million.[1] The huge accumulation of wealth in oil, steel, railroads, aluminum, and meatpacking made millionaires out of a handful of enterprising capitalists. Demographically, the five millions of 1800--6% of them urban inhabitants--became 36 millions by 1860 (20% urban) and 76 millions by 1900 (40% urban).[2] Culturally, the relatively homogeneous pre-industrial world at the century's inception had changed, particularly in metropolitan areas, into a mix of characters--German artisans, one-time Black slaves, *nouveau riche* white Anglo-Saxon Protestants, and, with the coming of the 1890s, immigrants from southeastern Europe. As the population increased by 113% after the Civil War, immigrants constituted one-third of that total.[3]

Linked to the growth of cities and industry was a prevailing fascination with technological accomplishment. As the application of mechanization to rural life resulted in more productive farms, so too did it strongly affect the city. The invention of the telegraph and telephone revolutionized communication. The Scholes typewriter and other business machines added to the efficiency of downtown offices. Trolley cars and subways facilitated access to the CBD. In 1835 the German economist Leo Hausleiter estimated the total capacity of machines in the world at 650,000 horsepower. By 1900 the United States alone had seventy million horsepower. If we assume one horsepower equals the labor of twelve men, the American people had in that year nearly one billion mechanical slaves working for them.[4] The great bulk of this machine work occurred in cities.

The mechanization and urbanization of American society had great impact on all social institutions, including the structure of higher education. Prior to the Civil War, colleges existed largely to train the sons,and, less commonly, the daughters of the gentry in an exacting regimen of classical studies, stringent discipline, and hard work. After plodding through drill and memorization exercises in a four year program of relentlessly-graded recitations, students graduated, hopefully filled with that precise, easily defined quality called "culture" but ill-suited for any profession. With the exception of those trained in divinity, medical, and law schools, students learned how to manage a business or a large estate by imitating the example of their fathers. High tuition costs, aristocratic snobbishness, difficult entrance examinations, and the working class distaste for refined culture prevented most Americans from decuring a college education. In 1838 only one in every 1,294 boys had attended college, a number which reached one in every 1,921 by 1869. The average American college as late as 1870 had but ten faculty and less than one hundred students.[5]

The early colleges revolved around the twin axes of discipline and religion. Each student was forced to adhere to an elaborate code of rules for every waking hour--rules which required frequent, if not daily, chapel attendance. All students took the same curriculum. The president, almost always a clergyman, taught upper-level classes and conducted collegiate affairs without the benefit of an administration. The college physical plant was quite small (usually no more than one building), libraries meager, laboratories tiny or non-existent, and funding often inadequate.[6] Tuition provided 75 to 100% of the income for operating expenses. Private benefactions never exceeded $50,000 at one offering (Abbot Laurence left that amount to Harvard[7]). Ninety per cent of all institutions of higher education were privately maintained. States at times reluctantly gave small allotments to colleges and only two cities, Louisville and Charleston, funded municipally-controlled institutions. The federal government provided nothing at all for higher education until the Morrill Act of 1862. Before 1865 there was little effort expended to change the character of higher education. Virtually every observer viewed the college as a comparatively fixed and static institution which communicated universal values and truths.

After the Civil War, however, new conceptions of learning emerged, fostered, in part, by the developing heterogeneity, industry, and fluid capital in large cities. American philanthropists--not only members of the old, hereditary "aristocracy" but nouveau riche capitalists--made large sums of money available for higher education. Ezra Cornell, for one, gave $500,000 to establish the university which would bear his name. Another, Edward Tuck, left $300,000 to Dartmouth in the nineties to establish a School of Administration and Finance. In the 1899-1900 year no fewer than 25 institutions received benefactions of $100,000 or more, led by the University of Chicago with $1,563,695. Just one of these, the University of Cincinnati, which netted $115,000, was a publicly-supported school.[8] Such sums enabled institutions to innovate, producing what Harvard President Charles W. Eliot would call "an original piece of creative work"--the wide-ranging university.[9]

A part of the innovative activity in higher education after the Civil War centered around two concerns of the capitalist benefactors and founders: the need to train bookkeepers, clerks, and merchants for increasingly complex employment and the desire for a place where the research so crucial to industrial development could be conducted. Some believed that higher education, like the lower levels of the public school system, could become the "great instrumentality to lift all classes of people into a participation in civilized life"--a life based on nouveau riche ideals of order, self-discipline, civic loyalty, and respect for private property.[10] As sociologist David Riesman has pointed out, nineteenth century education created "inner-directed" men for an expansive society:[11]

> ...an industrial society nourishes a certain psychological set or drive: it tends to be expansionist, so that people feel inferior if "their" organization does not grow or progress; certain measurable, calculable, "rational" values are understood, while others can hardly be stated, let alone supported....[The inner-directed man] found security in moving to the periphery of the various frontiers and establishing an isolated and recognizable claim on a new piece of territory—often with quite grandiose and imperialistic trappings. If he founded a firm, this was his lengthened shadow.

Teachers trained students—although less profoundly as the century progressed—in inner-directed qualities like public decorum, business acumen, personal morality, and intellectual astuteness. Education, including higher education, became a vehicle not only for personal, but also for material, gain.

Inner-directed faculty members and college presidents, rooted in earlier decades (if not centuries), initially objected to some of the philosophical trends emerging in post-Civil War America. American educators initially resisted the "higher criticism" of German theologians—that effort to subject the Bible itself to "rational" or "scientific" analysis—as well as to the humbling theories of naturalist Charles Darwin. However, the attention paid to scientific research and the scientific method of inquiry after 1870 and the emerging recognition in academic circles that change was not only healthy but inevitable fostered an investigative spirit. Intellectuals among the clergy, men like Henry Ward Beecher, James Freeman Clarke, Phillips Brooks, and James McCosh, unable to refute Darwin's contentions, began to tell their parishioners that the Book of Genesis could not be taken literally. Herbert Spencer's *Social Statics* (1865) and *Principles of Biology* (1867) appealed to *nouveau riche* educators because these books justified *laissez faire* economics by arguing that man in society reached his highest development only when a "survival of the fittest" dynamic had unfettered play. Spencer endorsed science as a means of facilitating self preservation and privately sponsored higher education as instrumental in enabling the most "fit" to secure life's necessities.[12]

Spencer's theories appealed to both the nouveau riche and the older gentry, for they modernized the long-time belief in predestined hierarchies (master-slave, better sort-meaner sort, weaker sex-stronger sex) by asserting that each individual was born with certain attributes which either facilitated or limited his or her capacity to succeed in life; those with the greatest ability, then, succeeded at their chosen "calling" and directed society. In these terms, the people at the top of society deserved to be there because they were there. When Herbert Spencer came to America for a series of lectures in 1882, his ideas had already received widespread acclaim in American intellectual circles. In particular, John Fiske at Harvard and William Graham Sumner at Yale became avid popularizers of his social Darwinism.[13] A survey of graduating seniors at Michigan State Universit in 1881 revealed the extent to which Darwinian thought had become acceptable; there twenty-six of thirty-three graduates admitted to a belief in evolution.[14]

Between 1882 and 1900 social Darwinism branched in two general directions, one Conservative and the other focused on reform. Fiske and Sumner, as Conservatives, believed that evolution had stamped the different races and sexes with inherent, and all but ineradicable, strengths and weaknesses through a centuries long process of natural selection. The immediate environment an individual lived in had minimal effect on his or her capacities. Both men and women were considere not very malleable. As Amos G. Warner, the general agent for the Charity Organization Society of Baltimore, pointed out in American Charities (1894), deterioration of character was the immediate cause of poverty; "evil associations" and "unwise philosophy" produced "indolence," "lubricity," and inumerable "unhealthy appetites." Providing good example and precept to enable the individual, against the evolutionary odds, to conquer "mere animal caprice" became the moralistic essence of "scientific charity."[15] That emphasis hearkened back to puritannical notions of man's birth in sin and the primacy of ministerial effort to aid redemption.

As the old Puritans had, the new Puritans in a new America regarded education youngster away from his or her primitive self. In New York City the Reverend William S. Rainsford rhapsodized, "the one way to bring better times, better civilization, better men, better women is education."[16] But it was education with limits. Conservative Darwinists wished to expand elementary school training for most Americans, but maintained that the "least fit" individuals--immigrants from southeastern Europe, Amerindians, Blacks, most poor whites--need not have access to institutions of higher education. If anything, they were "destined" for employment at the bottom, low-skilled rungs of the economic ladder and for training at no higher occupations than the manual arts. In its most extreme interpretation, Conservative Darwinism was used to justify racism and ethnic prejudice--even to the violent activities of the American Protective Association in the nineties and the lynching of over one hundred Blacks a year in the South. Numerous social theorists attacked the "unrestrained commingling of...defectives with the people" as a harbinger of evolutionary backsliding.[17]

Reform Darwinists like Albion Small and Lester Frank Ward, on the other hand, celebrated cooperation over competition--the linkages between aspects of society over the individualistic "struggle for life."[18] Their perception of the interconnectedness of supply and demand, of industries producing capital and consumer goods, coupled with the interdependence defining human relationships within the city, undoubtedly fed into their growing preoccupation with metropolitan unity--notwithstanding the social diversity so obviously existent in cities. At the turn of the century, Nicholas Murray Butler would state the prevailing mood as follows: "The old individualistic standpoint from which it was possible to regard society as made up of so many thousands or millions of independent units is no longer tenable. We have been taught that society is an organism, not a machine."[19] The organic metaphor soon became the vehicle for describing relationships within the city and in society at large. Charles Kendall Adams in the nationalistic nineties would describe the organic unity of university and state: "The university is not a party separate from the State. It is a part of the State--as much a part of the

State as the Capitol itself--*as mach [sic] as the brains and hand are parts of the body*."[20]

Whereas the Conservative Darwinists concentrated on determining relative degrees of fitness, Reform Darwinists directed their energy at managing the evolutionary process itself, toward focusing on how mankind as a group could sufficiently adapt or select out those characteristics which would advance the species, not within centuries but decades. Making higher education accessible to a larger number of Americans could, it was believed, facilitate that process. The organic unity of society could be reified and secured only through the encouragement of those inner-directed qualities, like initiative and responsibility, which democracy needed. Citing the example of the German universities, many observers claimed that American higher education should, like those institutions, train the professional teachers, professional public servants, and professional diplomats so essential to democratic society. German ideas like the seminar method of study, the laboratory system of scientific teaching, the lecture method, manual arts training, the emphasis on productive research, and the utility of a Ph. D. degree gathered momentum among edmcators here. It was a development closely cued to the German origins or training of a new stock of American educational leaders. By 1900 the German philosopher Friedrich Paulsen would claim institutions of higher education were more thoroughly "Germanized" in the United States than in any other country outside Germany.[21] Reform Darwinists avidly supported this Germanization.

The expansive thrust of the times, coupled with the seeming chaotic march of late nineteenth century events, added to the appeal of Reform Darwinism. The psychicly disrupting effects of Civil War, economic depression, Granger agitation, Populist "conspiracy," labor unrest, Black migration to the cities, and the immigrant influx together helped to create a need for unity. Yellow journalism, the telegraph, and the telephone helped to transmit information about such concerns to a wider audience than ever before, with the result that popular apprehension or fear could be more easily activated and magnified. Faced with these anxieties, the social gospel movement attempted to bring a unified morality back into metropolitan life, while the sponsorship of settlement houses was directed at creating good citizens and neighborliness.

By the latter decades of the nineteenth century, urban middle class Americans were paying more attention to popular attitudes and to the peer group as a means of establishing some kind of identity. The shift from inner-directed to other-directed man, fed by the status anxiety experienced by many of the nouveau riche, had begun. While the gentry assumed the fixity of their social position and the slum dweller had little opportunity to internalize the notion that a man is what he makes himself, the middle class had less surity. Seeking security in conformity, the other-directed man homogenized, in his own mind's eye, the diverse society of which he was a part and further decreased the probability of any marked eccentricities in social institutions.[22] As University of California President Benjamin Ide Wheeler explained:[23]

> We are first and foremost social beings; we are animals of the pack. And the more we try to draw away into the life of rational individualism the stronger do we feel at times the pull of reaction toward our real and native state. We cannot separate ourselves too far therefrom without grave risk. We have got to share our lives with others in order to have them normal. Ultra-individualism means isolation; it is good as a corrective or a stimulant, but it is not good as a steady food.

Middle-class people's search for general patterns which could provide an organizing principle for their increasingly other-directed lives manifested itself through the popular preoccupation with organic unity. Higher education also mirrored that concern. The university sought to embrace liberal arts, research, and practical public service within a coherent structural whole. But it was not easy to unify the component elements of higher education in the face of the presumed deleterious, "individualizing" effects of departmental autonomy. Laurence R. Veysey has described how institutions remedied this problem: "The university went several different ways at once. It crystallized into a collection of divergent minds, usually ignoring each other, commonly talking past one another, and periodically enjoying the illusion of dialogue on 'safe' issues."[24]

The illusion that all departments within the university worked together like organs in the body served as a parallel for the relatedness of the university to the total organism of society. After all, it was assumed, society could only be perfected if all its interrelated parts meshed together in harmonious synchrony.

Washington State University President E. A. Bryan in 1898 explained that education should not, in the style of the classical college, train "for a holiness class which is rendered unclean by contact with material concerns." Instead, he declared, it should tie into all "the interests of human life, not merely the spiritual or aesthetic." F. W. Kelsey of the University of Michigan reiterated a similar theme, asserting that the "throbbing life of to-day demands from our colleges something besides learning and culture. It cares not for pedants steeped in useless lore. It calls for true men, who are earnest, and practical, who know something of the problems of real life and are fitted to grapple with them."[25] Only then could higher education serve as "a fundamental lever of social and political regeneration."[26]

Overcoming the problems of "real life," in Reform Darwinist terms, meant that the university and college perform an important service function for society. Consequently, states and municipalities began taking a new look at financing public higher education, with an initial focus on opening up educational opportunities to people in rural areas. States established land grant colleges to teach agriculture and the mechanic arts, under the provisions of the Morrill Act. These institutions were closely connected to state departments of agriculture and assisted them by testing soil friability, analyzing fertilizers, attempting to develop more prolific plant hybrids, fighting animal tuberculosis, and pioneering in the production of new livestock feeds.[27] Rural universities pushed research in "scientific" farming, an activity boosted by the Hatch Act of 1887, which appropriated $15,000 annually for any agricultural experiment stations established in the United States.[28] Experiment stations had earlier been created in Connecticut (1875), California (1875), and North Carolina (1877) on the well-known German model.[29] Over a four year period following enactment of the Hatch Act, universities in 28 states and territories formed agricultural extension branches. Another twelve institutions began such work between 1892 and 1905. However, the emphasis of all extension divisions save two focused on the expansion of agricultural production. Only the University of Chicago in the 1890s and the University of Wisconsin a little later conducted extension courses which had any relevance to the urban situation.[30]

Aided by breakthroughs in the biological sciences and the interest in organic chemistry, rural universities made enormous contributions to farming efficiency and to the quality of rural life. Agriculturally-oriented state legislatures placed these institutions outside metropolitan areas, because the legislators viewed the changing big city as a source of vice, alcoholism, ethnic "mixing," and other evils. It was also easy to establish state institutions in rural locales where few interest groups had to be appeased. In part, their founders designed such universities as a vehicle for increasing the prestige value of ordinary occupations--a concern growing out of the confrontation between urban and rural life styles. An early Wisconsin legislative report, as one example, concluded in 1858 that state residents had a right to expect a university "adapted to popular needs, that its courses of instruction shall be arranged to meet as fully as possible the wants of the greatest number of our citizens. The *farmers*, *mechanics*, *miners*, *merchants*, *and teachers* of Wisconsin, represented in this legislature, have a right to ask that this bequest of the government shall aid them in securing to themselves and their posterity, such educational advantages as shall fit them for their pursuits in life, and which by an infusion of intelligence and power, shall elevate those pursuits to a social dignity commensurate with their value."[31] Other observers noted that rural institutions could—instead of merely dignifying the ordinary—educate men to rise above their environment's options. James Bryce explained,[32]

> [The rural institutions] get hold of a multitude of poor men, who might never resort to a distant place of education. They set learning in a visible form, plain, indeed, and humble, but dignified even in her humility before the eyes of a rustic people, in whom the love of knowledge, naturally strong, might never break from the bud into the flower but for the care of some zealous gardener. They give the chance of rising

> in some intellectual walk of life to many a strong and earnest nature who might otherwise have remained an artisan or storekeeper, and perhaps failed in those avocations.

In the cities sentiment grew for expanded educational opportunities as well--especially among the sons of entrepreneurs and professionials. As early as 1826 the Charleston City Council appropriated $2,000 to purchase "philosophical apparatus" for the classical college located there, then, after that institution suspended operations due to financial problems ten years later, reopened the school under municipal control in 1839.[33] Similarly, in 1840 Louisville aldermen authorized funds to maintain a college there which offered courses in mathematics, natural philosophy, ancient languages, moral philosophy, rhetoric, and French. Six years later Council merged that institution with the Louisville Medical Institute as the University of Louisville, but that corporation specialized only in medicine and law.[34] New York City (City College--1847; Hunter College--1870), Cincinnati, and Toledo also supported institutions of higher education from municipal funds.

After the Civil War, some metropolitan educators moved away from the classical belief that the enjoyment of the life of the mind was a legitimate consummation in itself, and began more fully to emphasize knowledge as a useful instrument for attaining other ends--business or professional careers, good citizenship, "democratic living," and a "stronger, freer social order."[35] They attacked the social and intellectual snobbery so apparent among the gentry in classical colleges.[36] Nouveau riche educators aped the "culture" and prestige of the gentry, but failed to identify completely with them. In an expansive, materialistic age they defined democracy as the freedom to pursue one's economic objectives. They and the large number of nouveau riche students enrolling in universities saw higher education as a vehicle for nursing their "natural" ability, enabling them to learn job skills for survival in the complexities of urban life. Looking back to Thomas Jefferson, the entrepreneurs felt higher education could sift out the "natural" aristocracy of "virtue and talents" by training a corps of civil servants whose understanding and grasp of socio-political problems would equip them for leadership in America. Higher education became both a nourisher and symbol of success to them. As Laurence Veysey has indicated, "an academic degree was like an insurance policy against downward mobility."[37]

After 1865, institutions of higher education modeled themselves around a business image--at least in terms of the money spent on conspicuous buildings, the prominence of fraternities, the affirmation of interdepartmental synchrony (however illusory that might be), the emergence of bureaucracy, and the competition between universities for prestige.[38] Physical plants became larger, libraries more impressive, and research laboratories common in all scientific fields. The influence of *laissez faire* economics on higher education became so strong that at one institution, City College, faculty members had to hold "correct views upon political economy--upon the intercourse between nations--upon the freedom of exchange--and upon the right of every citizen to sell in the dearest and buy in the cheapest markets of the world."[39] Instead of a patriarchal disciplinarian, the university president—often with training in the sciences—became more of a public spokesman and business manager. Still a strong figure as the head of a corporation, he had not yet come to rely very heavily upon his fellow administrators for advice in running his institution. yet, not so heavy handed as his ministerial precursors, he had a practical bent which diminished the rigor of instruction techniques and of required religious duties.[40]

Universities began offering a range of courses to provide numerous alternatives for professional training for the children of the *nouveau riche* and gentry. Between 1865 and 1903 the interest in prescribed studies and unidimensional curriculums decreased in favor of the elective system.[41] Specialized institutions also increased in number. Between 1870 and 1890 the boom in two year normal schools offered women, primarily, an opportunity to study "the science and art of teaching." By 1899-1900 no fewer than 305 normal schools existed in the United States, including 148 controlled by private groups, 127 by states, 27 by cities, and three by counties.[42] Although the number of theology schools declined, those specializing in law, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine boomed, as Chart # 1 indicates.

CHART # I: PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS FOUNDED IN AMERICA 1765-1900[43]

Dates	Theology	Law	Medicine	Dentistry	Pharmacy	Veter. Medicine	Total
1765-1800	3	3	3	0	0	0	9
1801-25	18	3	12	0	2	0	35
1826-50	25	7	22	2	4	0	60
1851-75	72	24	33	7	8	2	146
1876-1900	47	50	86	47	38	15	283
	165	87	156	56	52	17	533

The number of students enrolled in these professional schools comprised 32.16% of the total college population in 1872, 33.91% in 1889-90, and 20.98% in 1899-1900.[44]

University expansion became the order of the day. From 1887 to 1902 the average university's student body increased fivefold and the institution's budget from $150,000 to $500,000.[45] Enrollment at four year institutions shot upward from 81,493 in 1888-9 to 277,322 just eleven years later, while the number of students in graduate divisions surged from the 198 of 1871 to 2,382 in 1891 and 7,385 in 1900.[46] The students per million Americans steadily increased from 852 in 1872 to 1,121 in 1875, 1,183 in 1880, 1,130 in 1884-5, 1,327 in 1889-90, 1,763 in 1894-5, and 3,644 in 1899-1900. Only one college granted a graduate degree in 1869-70, but thirty years later 52 institutions granted 322 Ph. D's to men and twenty to women.[47]

Despite this expansion, professional, classical, and liberal arts studies' dominated the course offerings at institutions of higher learning in the 1890s as in the 1850s. In 1899-1900 students were enrolled in various courses in the following numbers:[48]

Professional	133,920	48.29%	Classical	37,658	13.58%
Medicine	25,213		General Culture	19,391	6.99%
Law	12,516		Commerce	14,610	5.27%
Teaching	79,117		Engineering	13,918	5.02%
Theology	8,009				

Dentistry	7,928		Music	15,302	5.52%
Pharmacy	4,040		Graduate School	7,385	2.66%
Military Drill	12,325	4.44%	Agriculture	2,852	1.03%
			Art	2,107	.76%
General Science	10,925	3.94%	Architecture	459	-----

Many institutions expanded, but almost always within a democratic elitist framework. In that respect, the University of Cincinnati is fairly representative. Founded as a municipal university in 1870, that school offered free tuition in an effort to "open the door of higher education to hundreds...who are now hopelessly excluded from the same." The curriculum, however, was designed to attract an entrepreneurial clientele. U. C. made little attempt to found practical courses in mechanics and commerce, instead broadening educational opportunities within a professional/cultural sphere. Course offerings emphasized "law, medicine, dentistry, astronomy, music, and fine arts." High admission standards made the enrollment of poor children unlikely. The university's objective, as stated in one report, was to "grow up in our midst an aristocracy of intellect and cultivation."[49]

As early as 1889 one person would claim that "every youth who is devoting his energies to getting an education has in view the bettering of his personal conditions or the maintaining of conditions already achieved by his parents."[50] Since social ambition had replaced the doctrine of learning for its own sake, the students by late century usually indicated little concern for the great issues of the day--Populism, American Protective Association agitation, the Haymarket Riot. Football, fraternities, and sophomore-freshman interclass warfare received considerably more attention in the student press. Such new interests, coupled with the decline of piety, would lead one observer to describe the late nineteenth century student as "a careless boy-man, who is chiefly anxious to 'have a good time,' and who shirks work and deceives his instrmctors in every possible way."[51]

Despite the sharp proportional increase in college enrollment figures, as of 1900 less than 4% of America's college-age youth actually attended any institution of higher learning. One study at the University of Michigan in 1902 revealed the exclusive nature of the student body there. Businessmen, lawyers, doctors, engineers, and pharmacists comprised one-half of the total fathers of U. M. students; only 5.21% of the fathers were mechanics, craftsmen, or skilled laborers.[52] Noticeably absent were members of any non-White racial group. Conservative Darwinists required, after all, that some "undeveloped" groups fall by the wayside. They argued that centuries of evolution had bred criminal tendencies, servility, immorality, egotism, and self-conceit into the Black character, in particular, so that servitude was the Black's "ordained place in society." No more than an "amiable blockhead," the Black man or woman could not be expected to benefit from higher education, except by absorbing notions of thrift and decency from a study of the mechanical and scientific trades.[53]

Reform Darwinists, including some Black leaders, rejoined that the Anglo-Saxon had no superiority in "intellectual gifts or moral endowments"--merely in ambition. Instead of turning to heredity as a universal explanation, these reformers attributed Black failings to an unfavorable environment, one which, they believed, was creating "a race of mental dyspeptics." Torn away from Africa and subjected to slavery, Black people had "escaped the gradual process of evolution, and education must span that gap." Education could not overcome heredity, but it could "at least discount it by an enormous per cent," enabling the Black man "to bring the wild energy of his muscle under the guiding intelligence of his mind." Crime, poverty, ignorance, and "vicious tendencies" could be eradicated by proper schooling at all levels and by hard work. Kelly Miller of Howard University put it all in survival of the fittest terms: "The Negro is excluded not so much because he is black but because he is weak....The negro must dig his civilization out of the ground, as all other races have done." Blacks needed, he thought, a trained leadership to counteract environment and tradition, for "if the blind lead the blind all will land in the ditch."[54]

Reform Darwinist thought had but little impact in opening the colleges to Blacks or bringing greater numbers of either Blacks or the new immigrants into institutions of higher education. In the South, four negro colleges were opened between 1864 and 1869, sixteen in the 1870s, and fourteen more in the last two decades of the century. Supported in large part by private philanthropy, these colleges graduated 1,941 "colored" Americans, but the number receiving degrees did not increase, relative to the number of college-age Blacks, while the proportion of white graduates doubled. Only 310 Blacks per million attended any college; the white figure was ten times higher. Only 73 "biracial" colleges and universities graduated just 389 "colored" students between 1826 and 1899, and Oberlin College was responsible for one-third of that total. Most institutions outside of the South did not actually exclude Blacks, but the lack of a high school diploma, entrance exams requiring a knowledge of Latin and Greek, and the currency of Conservative Darwinist thought kept them out.[55]

Those Blacks who earned degrees shared the assumptions of their democratic elitist, social Darwinist white contemporaries. One detailed study conducted by W. E. B. Dubois at Atlanta University revealed that they indeed wanted to become the "most fit" members of a Black leadership elite. In classic inner-directed style, they concluded Blacks "must rise as individuals and not as a mass." As one male phrased it, "We should never forget that the world belongs to him who will take it." Dubois himself believed that colleges should "supply thoroughly trained teachers, preachers, professional men, and captains of industry" for the race, and his study bore out that fact. Like clockwork, 53.4% of all "College-Bred Negroes" became teachers, 16.8% clergymen, 11.0% doctors or lawyers, and 3.6% businessmen. After graduation, they tended to locate in Southern Black communities where they were not prohibited from exercising a leadership role. Fully 90% of all Southern-born Black collegians remained in the South and one-half of their Northern-born brothers resettled in Dixie Land. The college-bred Negroes thereby posed no problem to white Americans. Nor did they, as successful Blacks, support opening up the universities to all "colored citizens." They appeared to have little interest in philanthropy on behalf of their race. Just twelve did charitable work with nurseries or orphanages, only fifteen participated in organized charity projects, and but sixteen involved themselves in slum, prison, or temperance activities. Rather, with few exceptions, they led, in Booker T. Washington form, by the power of inner-directed example.[56]

One disadvantaged group, women, did make some inroads, primarily because society needed teachers and females could be hired in that capacity for one third to one half of the average male salary. Women comprised 19.32% of all students in 1889-90, 23.51% in 1894-5, and 39.57% in 1899-1900. The number of females enrolled in institutions of higher education increased nearly three times as fast as the number of men. The percentage of colleges admitting both sexes jumped from 14.5% of the total in 1873 to 51.3% in 1880, 65.6% in 1890, and 71% in 1900.[57] However women's training followed very limited directions. Members of "the weaker sex" compris only 5.77% of the students in medical and 4.85% of those in pharmacy schools. Corresponding percentages for theology, dental, and law schools were only 2.26%, 2.02%, and 1.21%, respectively.[58] Just 5.85% of all Ph. D's granted that year went to women.[59] Although females could attend classes at the state universities, they were prohibited from enrollment in the municipally-controlled colleges at Toledo, Louisville, and Charleston. City College in New York City was exclusively male and offered a variety of programs, but its parallel institution for women, Hunter College, offered only teacher training.[60] The University of Cincinnati alone, of all municipal four year institutions, admitted both men and women, but there too 80.83% of the female students were enrolled in the collegiate course, whereas 73.62% of the males took courses from the professional departments in 1899-1900. Only one of the 143 U. C. instructors was a woman.[61] Most universities followed the U. C. pattern. Women, in fact, kept liberal culture courses (the humanities) alive there.[62]

In the western universities and land grant colleges coeducation was the rule from the earliest years, but the issue generated much controversy in the urban institutions of eastern America. In the South only six large universities adopted coeducation. Charleston College twice rejected efforts directed at that end in 1894 and 1896.[63] In the northeast, Yale and Columbia admitted women in 1900, but only in the graduate departments.[64] Other eastern institutions established co-ordinate colleges for women in connection with men's schools (*e. g.*, Western Reserve University, Brown, Tulane, Tufts) or separate colleges which were annexed to, but not an integral part of, a male university (Radcliffe-Harvard, Barnard-Columbia).[65]

Eastern and southern faculty members supplied a variety of reasons for rejecting the entrance of women into all-male schools. Some claimed that coeducational colleges "effeminized the men too much--occupations and sports in which women could not join were dropped, and men took their exercise in dancing instead of cross-country runnings." An occasional educator said that males and females "got to know one another too well, that mystery was too much dissipated, and the attraction of marriage weakened." Others maintained that coeducation overtaxed the less well-developed female brain, producing menstrual irregularity and outright physiological debilitation.[66] The Conservative Darwinist could emphatically argue, "Throughout the entire period of her existence woman has been man's slave; and if the theory of evolution be in any way correct, there is no reason to suppose, I imagine, that she will recover from the mental disabilities which this has entailed upon her within any period of time which we, for practical purposes, can regard as reasonable. Education can do little to modify her nature."[67]

Defenders of coeducation maintained, on the contrary, that contact with the opposite sex was good, smoothing the male's "rough edges" and diminishing female sentimentality.[68] Dr. E. E. White reported that the "different minds" argument made no sense at all, for "diverse minds [could] derive a diversity of preparation from the same course of education," just like "the oak and the elm grow in the same soil." A study of the health of female college graduates, conducted by the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor in 1899, confirmed White's belief that sexual differences need not be perceived hierarchically. The study discovered that "over one-half of the graduates are not and have not been troubled with nervousness, and that nearly 25 per cent have had no trouble at any time during the menstrual period....[They] entered college in good health, passed through the course of study prescibed without material change in health, and since graduation, by reason of the effort required to gain a higher education, do not seem to have become unfitted to meet the responsibilities or bear their proportionate share of the burdens of life....A breaking down in health does not appear to be more frequent with women than with men."[69] University of Kansas officials reported that coeducation had occurred there without a "whimper of a scandal" and University of Iowa administrators described it as an "incitement to every virtue."[70] Some educators maintained coeducation could facilitate the "struggle of life" by accentuating competitiveness (the boys' for the girls' favors) and knowledge of the "real."[71]

The movement to expand white women's collegiate opportunities bore some fruit, but a similar effort oh behalf of Black women had little support. Before 1899, but one in every ten Black graduates was female. No Black women's colleges opened to complement the white female colleges emerging all over the South after the Civil War. A mere 82 Black women graduated from "biracial" institutions, including 55 from Oberlin, and another 170 from southern "colored colleges." Despite a pick up of ← female enrollment to 22% of all students at Howard, Atlanta, Fisk, and Shaw in the late nineties, theorists continued to view their higher education as of little consequence. When valued at all, developing "a higher tone of family life" became a more important educational aim than enhancing the Black woman's employment opportunities. When Mary Church Terrell, first president of the National Association of Colored Women, pointed out that "the darker sister" faced the double oppression of race and sex, her words had a ready ring of truth.[72]

Interest in coeducation was not the only late century reform directed at broadening accessibility. Some institutions made an effort to provide job training for the poorer urban residents. In 1879 Calvin M. Woodward, after declaring that classical education "often unfits than fits a man for earning his living," established the first manual training school in the United States at Washington University in St. Louis. Private manual training institutes soon opened at Chicago (1884), Cleveland (1886), Cincinnati (1886), New Orleans (1886), New York City (1887), and Cambridge (1888). The cities of Baltimore (1884), Philadelphia (1885), and St. Paul (1888) financed such ventures from their public treasuries. Although these schools generally served more as an adjunct to high school, instead of college, learning, they did represent early efforts to make the vocational function an important part of higher education.[73] Only at Toledo did a four year public University of Arts and Trades specializing completely in "practical" studies exist (1884-1902).[74]

A few institutions of higher education--Stanford and some of the state universities--welcomed students from a wide range of backgrounds, but perhaps the most unique nineteenth century adventure in "equalizing" metropolitan higher education took place in New York City. There the Free Academy was launched in 1847. That high school parallel institution became a college with power to grant B. A. and B. S. degrees seven years later. Maintained by the City Board of Education, City College's founders had high hopes of using it to educate the poor.[75] The Regents of the University of New York reported, concerning the Free Academy's advocates:[76]

> ...their design is to offer the idea of a College, which, while it shall be in no way inferior to any of our colleges in the character, amount, or value of the information given to the pupils; the courses of studies to be pursued will have more especial reference to the active duties of operative life, rather than those more particularly regarded as necessary for the Pulpit, Bar, or the Medical Profession. Another important feature in the proposed plan is, that the laboring class of our fellow citizens may have the opportunity of giving

> to their children an education that will more effectually fit them for the various departments of labor and toil by which they will earn their bread. Such an Institution, where Chemistry, Mechanics, Architecture, Agriculture, Navigation, physical as well as moral or mental science, &, &, are thoroughly and practically taught, would soon raise up a class of mechanics and artists, well skilled in their several pursuits, and eminently qualified to infuse into their fellow-workmen a spirit that would add dignity to labor--a spirit, congenial with the character of our Republican institutions, while at the same time the diffusion of correct knowledge among the working class of our population, would make them better acquainted with their inestimable value.

The Free Academy received a good deal of support from New York's working classes, a fact reflected in the margin of approval voters gave the institution on June 7, 1847--19,305 for to 3,409 against.[77] At its opening on January 29, 1849, the first Principal, Horace Webster, paid tribute to the democratic spirit which had brought the academy into existence:[78]

> The Free Academy is now to go into operation. The experiment is to be tried, whether the highest education can be given to the masses; whether the children of the people, the children of the whole people, can be educated; and whether an institution of learning, of the highest grade, can be successfully controlled by the popular will, not by the privileged few, but by the privileged many.

Still, the new institution did not live up to such idealistic rhetoric. The course of studies was heavily classical--composition and declamation, Latin, French, Spanish, natural and experimental philosophy, moral and intellectual philosophy--with only one study, bookkeeping, offered "in order to qualify young men for merchantile pursuits."[79] Consequently, the great majority of students came from upper middle class backgrounds. Only an occasional cartman's son intruded on the usual list of merchants, lawyers, grocers, physicians, brokers, and clerks. Most students were American-born of Anglo-Saxon, Dutch, or Huguenot descent; just a handful of Irish and German immigrants attended classes.[80] Pupils formed literary societies and secret fraternities on the classical model.[81] Even after the Free Academy became the College of the City of New York in 1866, there seemed no justification for wealthy citizens' objections that their sons would be "elbowed off the course by hustling youngsters from the slums."[82]

As student enrollment at City College shot upward from 779 in 1869 to 974 in 1874 and 2,807 in 1904 and public appropriations for that institution increased from $42,528 in 1855 to $161,171 in 1874 and $313,362 in 1904, the private sector expressed some concern that competition would decrease applications at Columbia University and other private colleges.[83] The Conservative Darwinists among them may also have feared a new effort by City College to live up to its original ideals. Despite faculty criticism of President Alexander Stewart Webb for his lack of innovation in the eighties and nineties, as well as his belief that electives were "nonsense," Webb did expand vocational course offerings. He added several "practical" courses to the curriculum, including commercial training (1871), a post graduate course in civil engineering (1873), a chemical laboratory (1882), manual arts instruction (1883), professional work in education (1887), and a "scientific course with mechanics."[84] The manual arts addition became immediately popular, causing Microcosm, the school journal, to declare, "We are not a college of athletes, we wouldn't be if we could, we are simple workers."[85] Within a year, workshop studies were expanded into a five year course and joined to the Commercial Department. Mechanical arts students were, however, required to take liberal culture subjects, although liberal culture students need not take mechanics.[86]

City College officials took considerable pains to make it possible for poorer students to attend classes. They offered free tuition and in 1857 established the Students' Aid Fund, one of the earliest funds for the assistance of needy students at a publicly supported college. Students were aided through monetary allotments for collegiate living expenses and assisted in finding jobs while in school.[87] The institution further enhanced accessibility by in 1882 abolishing high school graduation as a necessary prerequisite for admission, instead allowing entrance to all male residents of the city who could pass a suitable examination.[88] City College did not have completely open admissions, but more persons were eligible there than in virtually any other major four year institution.

Throughout the century, City College students appeared willing to step out of the typical mold. In 1866 students began one of the first college newspapers. In the same year R. R. Bowker organized the first democratically elected student council to appear in any American college.[89] Like most college students of the period, they seemed to be little concerned with overtly building a better social order, but, unlike most students, they took considerable interest in contemporary issues. In the 1850s they debated the Homestead Bill's efficacy, abolitionism, secession, and the extension of aid to Hungarian revolutionaries. In the eighties and nineties attention focused around issues like the prohibition of Chinese immigration, the feasibility of civil service reform, the income tax, municipal ownership of public utilities, and Panamanian independence.[90] Of course, they also engaged in less intellectual activities, including playing whist in chapel study rooms, coaxing goats into chapel during opening exercises, disrupting commencement speeches, and collecting allegedly obscene books.[91]

Student interest in contemporary events, the lack of tuition, a relatively open admissions policy, and the manual arts offering attracted increasing numbers of poorer students to City College. By the 1890s students of northwestern European origins still predominated, but there was a substantial minority of Jews and Catholics--this despite some anti-Semitic sentiment on the part of the faculty in the 1880s. A sizable portion of the college population was also composed of working class students and recent immigrants from families of central and eastern European origin.[92]

By 1900 conditions in American institutions of higher education had indeed changed. University attendance, once limited to the gentry, had been expanded to draw in the sons and, importantly, the daughters of the nouveau riche. City College had managed to make a college education available even to some of the poor. Universities and colleges also served the public through expanded curriculum offerings. Although such expansion occurred usually only within a professional or scientific research sphere, the Toledo University of Arts and Trades, City College, and the rural land grant colleges provided training in "practical" manual arts courses. The universities served the business interests by adding commercial courses and doing some technological research, especially in engineering departments. But if the institutions of higher education served the community through training society's leaders and research, they did little in two respects: no real attention was directed toward personal counseling of students or toward intimate involvement in the affairs of the metropolis. Despite a widespread belief in the organic unity of things, only the extension effort in a few schools at all qualified as a community outreach program. That, however, would soon change.

FOOTNOTES

[1] S. E. Forman, *The Rise of American Commerce and Industry* (New York: Century, 1927), 481.

[2] U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *The Statistical History of the United States from Colonial Times to the Present* (Stamford, Conn.: Fairfield Publishers, Inc., 1965), 14.

[3] June Axinn and Herman Levin, *Social Welfare: A History of the American Response to Need* (N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1975), 77.

[4] George S. Counts, "Education and the Technological Revolution" in *Intellectual Foundations of American Education*, ed. by Harold J. Carter (N. Y.: Pittman Publ. Co., 1965), 38.

[5] Richard Hofstadter, "The Age of the University" in Hofstadter and C. DeWitt Hardy, *The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States* (N. Y., 1952), 29. See Table "Institutions of Higher Education--Number, Faculty, and Enrollment: 1870 to 1956" in *Stat. Hist. of U. S.*, 210-11.

[6] S. Willis Rudy, *The College of the City of New York: A History 1847-1947* (N. Y.: The City College Press, 1949), 47, 53.

[7] Walter P. Metzger, "Academic Freedom and Big Business," in R. Hofstadter and W. P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (N. Y., 1955), 413.

[8] Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (N. Y.: Random House, 1962), 266; *Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1899-1900*, II (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1901), 1362, 1877.

[9] Quoted in Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 364.

[10] Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), 17.

[11] David Riesman with Nathan Glazer and Reuel Denney, *The Lonely Crowd* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), xxxix, 138-9.

[12] Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955), 30-50; L. Cremin, *Transformation of the School*, 91-3.

[13] Hofstadter, ~~ibid~~., 48, 51-66.

[14] F. Rudolph, *Am. College & Univ.*, 347.

[15] J. Axinn & H. Levin, *Social Welfare*, 89-92; L. Cremin, *Transformation of the School*, 17-8. Eric F. Goldman's *Rendezvous with Destiny* (N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952), 93-7, contains a good description of issues between the Conservative and Reform Darwinists.

[16] Cremin, *ibid.*, 126.

[17] Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in Am. Thought*, 170-200; J. Axinn & H. Levin, *Social Welfare*, 91-2; Don S. Kirschner, "The Ambiguous Legacy: Social Justice and Social Control in the Progressive Era," *Historical Reflections*, II (1975), 76.

[18] Hofstadter, *ibid*., 67-84.

[19] Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 364.

[20] *Ibid*., 104.

[21] F. Rudolph, *Am. College & Univ.*, 330; W. Rudy, "Higher Education in the United States, 1862-1962," in *A Century of Higher Education: Classical Citadel to Collegiate Colossus*, ed. by William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer (N. Y.: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1962), 20-1.

[22] D. Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd*, 19-22, 70-3.

[23] L. Veysey, *Emergence of the Am. Univ.*, 363.

[24] *Ibid*., 58.

[25] *Ibid*., 61-2.

[26] L. Cremin, *Transformation of the School*, 88.

[27] "Memoir by Charles William Dabney," 135 (mspt at Hampden-Sydney Library); Alfred Charles True, *A History of Agricultural Experimentation and Research in the United States, 1607-1925*...(Washington: Dept. of Agriculture, 1937), 38-164.

[28] True, *ibid*., 124-30.

[29] *Ibid*., 82-91.

[30] Louis E. Reber, *University Extension in the United States* (U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin # 19, 1914), 5-6.

[31] R. Hofstadter, "The Age of the University," in *The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States*, ed. by Hofstadter and C. Dewitt Hardy (N. Y., 1952), 46.

[32] James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth* (N. Y., 1897), II, 893.

[33] R. H. Eckelberry, *The History of the Municipal University in the United States* (Washington: Bulletin of the U. S. Office of Education, # 2, 1932), 10-9; J. H. Easterby, *A History of the College of Charleston Founded 1770* (N. Y.: Scribner's, 1935), 90-118.

[34] Eckelberry, ~~ibid~~., 24-31.

[35] Hofstadter, "Age of the Univ." in Hofstadter & C. Hardy, *Development and Scope of Higher Educ.*, 104.

[36] L. Veysey, *Emergence of Am. Univ.*, 63.

[37] *Ibid.*, 265.

[38] *Ibid.*, 64, 346-9.

[39] S. Willis Rudy, *College of City of N. Y.*, 149.

[40] A. Laurence Lowell, *What A University President Has Learned* (N. Y.: Macmillan, 1938); Walter Schenkel, "Who Has Been in Power?' in Harold L. Hodgkinson and L. Richard Meeth, eds., *Power and Authority* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971), 1-24.

[41] F. Rudolph, *Am. College & Univ.*, 287-306.

[42] L. E. Blauch and H. R. Bonner, *Statistics of Normal Schools, 1917-8* (Washington; Bulletin of the Bureau of Education, # 81, 1920), 4-11.

[43] From a chart in James Russell Parsons, Jr., "Professional Education," in *Education in the United States: A Series of Monographs Prepared for the U. S. Exhibit at the Paris Exposition of 1900*, II (Albany: J. B. Lyon Co., 1900), ed. by Nicholas Murray Butler, 2.

[44] *Report of the Cmr. of Education, 1899-1900*, II, 1874.

[45] R. Hofstadter, "Age of the Univ." in Hofstadter & C. Hardy, *Development & Scope of U. S. Higher Educ.*, 45.

[46] These and the following figures, except where noted, have been compiled from statistical tables appearing in Reports of the Commissioner of Education for the designated years.

[47] *Statistical Hist. of the U. S.*, 212; *Report of Cmr. of Educ., 1899-1900*, II, 1876.

[48] These numbers include students in attendance at universities, colleges, professional institutes, and normal schools.

[49] R. Eckelberry, *History of the Municipal Univ.*, 82-94.

[50] L. Veysey, *Emergence of the Am. Univ.*, 269.

[51] *Ibid.*, 273-80.

[52] *Ibid.*, 291-2.

[53] Kelly Miller, "The Education of the Negro," in *Report of the Commissioner of Education, for the Year 1900-1901* (Washington, 1902), I, 794-6, 808, 812, 820, 841; "The College-Bred Negro" in *ibid. for the Year 1902* (Washington, 1903), I, 192-5.

[54] Miller, *ibid.*, 788-9, 801, 803, 807, 812, 822-3.

[55] *Ibid.*, 816, 832, 839; "College-Bred Negro," in *Report of Educ. Cmr. for 1902*, I, 192-5.

[56] "College-Bred Negro," *ibid.*, 196-224; Miller, *ibid.*, 840.

[57] *Report of Cmr. of Educ., 1899-1900*, II, 1967-73.

[58] Anna Tolman Smith, "Coeducation in the Schools and Colleges of the United States," *Report of Cmr. of Educ. for the Year Ended June 30, 1903* (Washington, 1905), I, 1064.

[59] *Report of Cmr. of Educ., 1899-1900*, II, 1876.

[60] *Ibid.*, II, 1988, 1994; R. Eckelberry, *Hist. of the Municipal Univ.*, 61-72.

61 *Cmr. of Educ. Report*, II, 1916-7.

62 L. Veysey, *Emergence of the Am. Univ.*, 271-2.

63 J. Easterby, *Hist. of College of Charleston*, 189

64 A. Smith, "Coed. in U. S. Schools & Colleges," *Report of Cmr. of Educ. for 1903*, I, 1065.

65 F. Rudolph, *Am. College & Univ.*, 320; "Coeducation of the Sexes in the United States," in *Report of Cmr. of Educ. for 1900-1901* (Washington, 1902), II, 1296-8.

66 W. T. Harris, "Reports of the Mosely Education Commission," in *Report of Cmr. of Educ. for the Year Ended June 30, 1905* (Washington, 1907), I, 6-9; "Coed. of the Sexes," *ibid.*, II, 1278-81; Edward H. Clarke, *Sex in Education: or, A Fair Chance for the Girls* (Boston, 1873).

67 Harris, *ibid.*, 7.

68 "Coeduc. of the Sexes," *Report of Cmr. of Educ. for 1900-1*, II, 1267, 1285-6.

69 *Ibid.*, II, 1247, 1278-81.

70 F. Rudolph, *Am. College & Univ.*, 328.

71 W. Harris, "Mosely Commission Reports," *Report of Cmr. of Educ.*, *1905*, I, 8.

72 K. Miller, "Educ. of the Negro," in *ibid.*, I, 824-7.

73 L. Cremin, *Transformation of the Am. School*, 27.

74 R. Eckelberry, *Hist. of the Municipal Univ.*, 103-8.

75 *Ibid.*, 177-8; S. W. Rudy, *College of the City of N. Y.*, 38-9.

76 Rudy, *ibid.*, 13.

77 *Ibid.*, 21.

78 *Ibid.*, 29.

79 *Ibid.*, 28, 33.

80 *Ibid.*, 68-9.

81 *Ibid.*, 75, 77.

82 *Ibid.*, 114-7.

83 *Ibid.*, 46,-110, 128.

84 *Ibid.*, 162, 164, 168; R. Eckelberry, *Hist. of Municipal Univ.*, 52-3.

85 Rudy, *ibid.*, 169.

86 *Ibid.*, 169-70.

87 *Ibid.*, 462.

88 R. Eckelberry, *Hist. of the Municipal Univ.*, 52-3.

89 S. Rudy, *College of the City of N. Y.*, 79, 462.

90 *Ibid.*, 76, 176, 187.

91 *Ibid.*, 72-3, 75.

92 *Ibid.*, 173-4, 178-9.

CHAPTER II: PROGRESSIVES SEARCH FOR UNITY, 1900-1917

The post-Civil War expansion and consolidation of American economic activity continued unabated over the first two decades of the twentieth century, although no longer under a rubric of "rugged individualism." This activity would establish a tone that affected, in one way or another, most of society's institutions, including institutions of higher education. Between 1899 and 1929 the number of manufacturing establishments increased by 273%. Over the same time the gross national product rose from $17 billion to $104 billion. Even allowing for changes due to inflation, the per capita GNP still soared upward by 73%. Industrialists formed trusts in such disparate businesses as railroads, utility companies, sugar, farm machinery, and bicycles. In 1897 only about a dozen corporations other than railroads were capitalized at $10 million, but just six years later that number reached 300, including seventeen capitalized in excess of $50 million and one, U. S. Steel, at nearly $1.5 billion.[1]

Booming industrial productivity fit hand in glove with the continuing urbanization of American life. Forty per cent of the 46.8 million people in the United States at the turn of the century lived in cities; by 1920, for the first time, slightly more Americans lived in urban than rural areas and the urban figure reached 56% by 1930. Three-fourths of the 14.5 million immigrants entering the country between 1900 and 1915 located in cities. A 1909 U. S. Immigration Commission study revealed that 57.8% of the children in the schools of 37 of the nation's largest cities were of foreign-born parentage, including 63.5% in Boston, 67.3% in Chicago, 71.5% in New York, and 74.1% in Duluth (Minnesota) and Chelsea (Massachusetts). These children spoke sixty different languages.[2] Blacks also settled in metropolitan areas in ever increasing numbers; the proportion of America's Blacks residing in urban locales rose from 27% in 1910 to 44% by 1930.[3]

In their search for opportunity in the cities, some Blacks and aliens succeeded. More often than not, however, their expectations were sharply blunted, because America's relative prosperity was disproportionately distributed. The percentage of national income in the hands of the wealthiest 1.6% of Americans had almost doubled between 1899 and 1910--from 10.8 to 19%. A federal Commission on Industrial Relations reported that one-half to two-thirds of all working class families suffered from the effects of impoverishment. One-third lived in "abject poverty." Price increases outstripped wage advances, adding to the problems created by irregular employment, unsanitary factory conditions, unprotected machinery, and sweatshop crowding. The annual turnover rate approached 100% in many industries. Recessions in 1910-1, 1914-5, and 1920-1 aggravated the workers' woes.[4]

Before 1917, such conditions helped exacerbate a growing sense of conflict in America. Farmers, as they had for some time, continued to attack the "organized money interests." Unions had mustered no serious threat to big business in the nineteenth century, but between 1898 and 1904 membership in the American Federation of Labor increased fivefold. The percentage of workers unionized jumped from 2.5 to 8% of all laborers. Many middle class Americans wished to break up the trusts as well, their sentiments fed by muckraker attacks on Standard Oil, the Union Pacific Railroad, the Chicago meatpacking industry, and political corruption. In the face of such opposition, capitalists could no longer afford to assert, as they had in the past century, "Let the public be damned." Between 1901 and 1905 business leaders formed a variety of trade associations aimed at fostering a positive public image.[5]

The tensions surfacing in pre-World War I times fanned the flames of conflict between Conservative and Reform Darwinists. Increasingly, Conservatives reiterated the view that nature was a battle between the "fit" and "unfit" for survival, hid their insecurities behind the bluster of militancy ("a good war halloweth any cause"), and launched a double-barrelled attack on Southeastern European immigrants/ Blacks/ Orientals on one hand and their Reform Darwinist critics on the other. Psychologists William McDougall and Edward Lee Thorndike hammered home the theme that instinct largely predetermined man's capacity for learning. Eugenicists claimed that prostitution, drunkenness, "poverty, dirt and crime" could all be "scientifically" explained by genetics. Karl Pearson, in fact, estimated that heredity accounted for 90% of man's capacity.[6] Considering non-Aryan peoples to be in an arrested stage of development--"half devil and half child"--Conservatives warned that the intimate relationships occurring in cities between "impure" aliens and "pure" White Anglo-Saxon Protestants could produce "a mongrel and degenerate breed." Too much familiarity was destroying civilization! At all costs, the organic integrity of the nation must be preserved. But that could occur only if the superior Anglo-Saxons ruled their inferiors with an iron hand. Jim Crow laws in the South testified to the form and force of that rule. No longer did Conservatives believe that social progress would inevitably result in a laissez faire system. Some management of the "unfit" was deemed necessary to insure the "fit's" survival.[7]

Unlike so many of their Conservative contemporaries, Reform Darwinists had never assumed the environment was a fixed norm, and their concern for manipulating it for the entire population's benefit picked up momentum after the turn of the century. From the University of Chicago, educator John Dewey repeatedly urged philosophers to shift their attention from sterile epistemology and metaphysics to politics, education, and morality, from passive discourse to social action. Herbert Croly advised Americans to think in terms of purpose rather than destiny and to use the centralizing power of government to implement policy. Croly's and Dewey's Reform colleagues avidly affirmed the virtues of an American melting pot--their faith that nature could accentuate the best in each ethnic or racial group instead of the reverse.[8] Clarence Darrow gave the appropriate Reform response when a Virginian asked him, "What about the purity of the Anglo-Saxon race?" Darrow's reply: "[They are the] greatest race of sons of bitches that ever infested the earth. Mind you, if there is such a race, I am one of them. But I do not brag about it; I apologize for it."[9]

Reform Darwinists lashed at "Conservatism's steel chain of ideas." Sociologist Edward Ross blurted out that Conservatives justified "a brutal selfishness as old as the Ice Age[, one which] struts about in phrases borrowed from the Darwinists and bids us see in the prosperity of the wicked the Success of the Adapted." In ostensibly scientific terms, Thorstein Veblen raked the "leisure class" over the coals for relying on fraud and chicanery to maintain "a parasitic character," thereby ceasing to be "in the full sense an organic part of the industrial community."[10] Various reformers pressed for regulation of the monopolies, minimum wage legislation, workman's compensation, and laws against child labor as a counterforce to those rugged individualists who made "selfishness...their only science." Community organizer Henry E. Jackson moralized, "The Greek word for 'private,' peculiar to one's self, unrelated to the interest of others, is the orginal of our word 'idiot.'"[11]

As the two groups of social Darwinists fought for intellectual ascendancy, the ghettoization of urban life proceeded apace. The reformers, most strongly in their Socialist branch, cried out that "industry had dissolved the fabric of community leaving alienation in its wake, and that this ultimately had caused the deterioration of life in the slum."[12] Tying into the frustrations experienced by so many workers, the Socialist Party made great political gains by arguing that the struggle for existence validated not individual competition but class conflict. With 5,000 members in 1900, it had 118,000 by 1912. In the latter year the Socialist Presidential candidate Eugene V. Debs received 6% of the popular vote and the Party elected 1,000 public officials throughout he nation.[13] Other reformers--those of more middle class origins--rejected socialism as too extreme and founded their own political organ, the Progressive or Bull Moose Party, or formed liberal groups within either of the two major political parties. The Progressive Presidential candidate in 1912, Theodore Roosevelt, became the only third party candidate to receive more votes than a major party opponent since the Civil War.

The prevailing atmosphere of political and economic tension made some inroads upon most social institutions, including that stronghold of the *nouveau riche*, the university. At City College in 1913 fully 7% of the graduating class listed their political party as Socialist and another 1% as Anarchist. There two years earlier students had organized a study chapter of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. By 1915 the University of Cincinnati also sported a Socialist Club.[14] At Toledo the Socialists clashed with industrialists over, among other things, the popular control of higher education. The influential capitalists who controlled the Board of Directors of Toledo University resisted an effort to place the municipally financed institution under management of the publicly elected Board of Education, a matter not officially resolved until the Ohio Supreme Court in the case of *Toledo v. Seiders et al.* (1911) decided in favor of the Directors. Toledo's wealthier residents objected to the amount of taxes levied to support this institution, in large part because of the Socialist impact there.[15] Toledo Socialists applauded the establishment of a course on "Labor Ethics" in 1905 and the supportive comments which occasionally came from university administrators. Other Toledoans complained that the university was becoming a hotbed of radicalism, pointing to such comments as proof. President Jerome H. Raymond in 1909 received sharp criticism for eulogizing Debs as "one of the greatest souls that ever lived." Six years later Scott Nearing, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, got into trouble for asserting that "President Woodrow Wilson is for [military] preparedness because he is a tool of the United States Steel Corporation." Nearing, moreover, claimed that social injustice had made the phrase "freedom and justice for all" in the oath of allegiance to the flag "a humbug, and we are putting misstatements into the mouths of children when we ask them to repeat these words." After much public outcry, the university's Board of Directors discharged the dean from office.[16]

At Toledo and in other cities a large proportion of Americans began to fear that divisiveness and difference might lead to social chaos. Increasingly, they came to believe that evolutionary progress could result only if the individual could be helped to overcome those "base passions" which inhibited the speedy realization of human perfectability. If Socialists, industrialists, and slum life could lead men astray and, in effect, create political havoc, red light districts, and inumerable saloons, then a proper environment and schooling could certainly clean up society. Since they believed the rugged individualism of the nineteenth century had gone amock, making social concerns secondary to the personal zeal for self-aggrandizement at any cost, Reform Darwinist Progressives wished to standardize values in the burgeoning metropolitan world, preferably along middle class lines. Urban society must be homogenized for the sheer sake of psychological order, through an emphasis on the Golden Rule, wholesome behavior, family solidarity, economic success, democratic action, and a belief in community. The school was central to establishing a sense of unity in tumultuous times. Princeton President Woodrow Wilson explained its crucial importance in 1916:[17]

> You know that the great melting-pot of America, the place where we are all made Americans of, is the public school, where men of every race and of every origin and of every station in life send their children, or ought to send their children, and where, being mixed together, the youngsters are all infused with the American spirit and developed into American men and American women.

Toward that end, Wilson, some, businesses, YMCAs, civic leagues, and Reform Darwinist public school spokesmen sponsored education for immigrant children.[18]

"Other-directed" educators believed democracy itself could not long survive without a careful attention to social concerns. John Dewey in 1916 described the prevailing philosophy:[19]

> ...[Democracy] is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full import of their activity. These more numerous and more varied points of contact denote a greater diversity of stimuli to which an individual has to respond; they correspondingly put a premium on variation in his action.

Adapting to a changing environment with a spirit of copperation, instead of competition, could foster the benefits of neighborliness and social order. Some observers, in fact, considered neighborliness the genetic norm— a primordial urge under assault by the disruptions of early twentieth century life. While some pastoral escapists sought relief from contemporary tensions through rhapsodizing about the benefits of Gesellschaft communities, other reformers sought actively to create urban neighborhood centers--those "houses of the people" which could serve as "a people's university, a community capitol, a forum, a neighborhood club, a home-and-school league, a community bank, and a cooperative exchange."[20]

To make "the American city of the future...the most splendid city of the world"--an organically interrelated "Co-operative Commonwealth"--middle class Progressives felt that society's poor must be provided with a proper social environment and taught respect for the law. Only that could bring about "a better feeling between the classes," minimize existing antagonisms, and counteract the growth of socialism in the country. (As Raymond Robbins pointed out, "Those four hundred thousand votes cast for Debs [in 1904] meant something.") Immigrants must be Americanized, the unemployed trained, the poor converted to middle class values.[21]

Contemporary fears about the acceleration of social disharmony significantly altered the notion of who was eligible tor inclusion within society's leadership groups. Students of human nature increasingly rejected the Conservative Darwinist's naturalistic determinism--their position that man's innate abilities and drive could lead him to the social heights. John Watson's behaviorism held that, since the conditioning influence of environment primarily determined the behavior of children and adults, human beings could be trained to achieve progressive social purposes through the use of a conditioned reflex.[22] Other psychologists and philosophers at Chicago, Clark, Columbia, and elsewhere developed theories of learning which emphasized the interaction between child and environment.[23] Franz Boas collected a compendium of anthropological data to disprove the

Conservative belief in the inherent inferiority of immigrants from southeastern Europe and Blacks. Picking up on Ernest Haeckel's Biogenetic Law "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny" (or, the development of the individual is a recapitulation of the development of the race), academics began applying the concept of evolution to changes occurring within one individual's lifetime.[24] Reform Darwinists repeatedly emphasized the importance of growth, of the individual getting his thoughts and feelings into some kind of coherent order as social conditions underwent alteration. Rigidity was against nature, for, as Clark President G. Stanley Hall exclaimed, "The student must have much freedom to be lazy, make his own minor morals, vent his disrespect for what he can see no use in, be among strangers to act himself out and form a personality of his own, be baptized with the revolutionary and skeptical spirit, and go to extremes at the age when excesses teach wisdom with amazing rapidity."[25] Frank E. Spaulding placed the instructor in a similar framework, as one who should develop an individual "living and growing" philosophy out of his or her own experience and not out of adaptations from "Hegel or Herbart, Harris or Hall."[26]

Since poverty and race no longer stood, for many, as irrefutable proof of one's natural incompetence in the struggle for survival, interest in the democratization of all aspects of life picked up. All governments, social organizations, institutions, and peoples were viewed as necessary parts of the "living organism" of society. Reconstituting the cells of that organism in the interests of its unity and continuity required an involved citizenry, creative leadership, the effective social use of scientific expertise, and individuals desiring to subordinate their self-interest to love of their fellow man. Crusades for municipal ownership of the utilities, the city manager plan of government, democratic control of school boards, and efforts to relieve the destitution of the poor reflected the Progressive concern of "regenerating" the social organism so that it enjoyed "vitality, life, and usefulness," instead of "disease and senile decay." [27]

Education, at the same time it homogenized values and inculcated selflessness, could also train the necessary scientists and managers of society from the ranks of social unknowns, those men untainted by a self-seeking nature or wealth. Woodrow Wilson celebrated these uneducated but humble men:[28]

> We overlook the fact that the real source of strength in the community comes from the bottom....Do you look to the ranks of men already established in authority to contribute sons to lead the next generation? They may, sometimes they do, but you can't count on them; and what you are constantly depending on is the rise out of the ranks of unknown men, the emergence of somebody from some place of which you had thought the least, of some man unanointed from on high, to do the thing that the generation calls for.

Other-directed leaders of simple origins--men who were "like the people impersonated, sublimated, touched with genius"--could result if the educational system became "independent of the caprices of millionaires [and] free from the domination of ignorant and prejudiced state legislators."[29] A progressive, orderly society needed men of new spirit to run it.

No one expressed the new emphasis in higher education better than University of Cincinnati President Charles William Dabney in 1914:[30]

> The progressive democratization is the most remarkable thing in the history of America....The respect for learning, bred into this people by these old colleges, created a sort of class feeling in America. This class feeling is, after all, a very simple thing; it is simply like seeking like. Church colleges and private institutions tend inevitably to produce it.... Democracy means an honest homogeneity, and such equal opportunity for the higher and professional education. The free public college and the state university were necessary, therefore, to save democracy in America from class stratification.... To believe in democracy, to believe in the equality of opportunity for all in the development of their lives, is to believe in the municipal university, the one thing needed to complete our American system of higher education....The city, as well as the Nation, is awakening to a recognition of the necessity for intelligent and righteous leadership....Hand in hand with the demand for the purification of the ballot and city administration goes the demand for higher ethical and educational standards. The university must make these standards, and it must train the leaders.

Other educators reiterated the concern that the university "produce the efficient man, the man related by forceful needs to the world without."[31] "Social efficiency" became one of the most frequently repeated phrases in the vocabulary of college presidents in the first two decades of the twentieth century.[32] In one examination of college aims stated in books and magazines between 1909 and 1921, Leonard Koos discovered that three-fourths of all statements emphasized civic and social responsibility, and 27.5% affirmed training for social leadership. Those figures constituted a sharp increase from the 29.6% and 11.1%, respectively, of the 1842-76 years.[33]

Training experts took on a new meaning in Progressive times. No longer was the university expected to focus on providing only the doctors, lawyers, and teachers for society, but the political thinkers, businessmen, and social engineers as well. In Samuel Haber's words, "The Scientific expert became the prototype of all administrators. He brought scientific wisdom down from the ivory tower and set it to work for the man in the street. 'The practical man,' declared Comptroller Metz, New York City's administrative reformer, 'knows how.

The scientific man knows why. The expert knows how and why.'"[34] Scientific experts could help the urban organism fufill its naturational destiny--to grow into an exceedingly proficient, more highly developed unit. By virtue of its closeness to the urban community, a municipal university could utilize existing institutions like libraries, art galleries, churches, theaters, parks, and lecture halls "to inform the political judgments of ordinary citizens," transmit middle class culture to the poor, and assist them in using "their leisure aright."[35] The experts could organize and manage all activities to the end of greater efficiency. Scientific management could eliminate waste, in the same way that the physical body of any healthy organism rid itself of "unproductive" materials.[36]

The Progressive urban university had a specifically organic function. As Charles Dabney explained, "A part of the city society, the municipal university is a vital organ of the body politic; it is, in fact, the brain directing all other organs, nourished by them and stimulating them in return."[37] Since the brain must practically respond to and integrate the needs of the body-community--in effect, "declare a war for civilization"[38]--then service became the glue which held the organism together.

A new, more expansive concept of service had begun emerging--one going far beyond mere attention to student access, practical training, and agricultural extension. Many observers maintained the university should turn its research capabilities to contemporary social problems: finding the causes of crime, discovering ways for industrial workers to efficiently re-design the work process, and enriching job content to allay employee disatisfaction.[39] In line with such concerns, the discipline of sociology expanded its influence and gradually shifted its effort from "analogical representation of social structures to real analysis of social processes." The sociological emphasis had turned away from a primary concern for the individual in society to one which focused on society as a unit. James Mark Baldwin expressed the beginning assumption of the new sociology in 1911, "The individual is a product of his social life and society is an organization of such individuals."[40]

Once sociologists and other researchers had analyzed social problems, they must next implement programs to solve them. The new profession of social work helped serve that end, and urban institutions took an active interest in expanding opportunities for the profession. In 1903 the University of Chicago in cooperation with Julia C. Lathrop of Hull House and Dr. Graham Taylor of Chicago Commons organized lecture courses in practical social work. A year later such offerings provided the basis for the Chicago Institute of Social Science, which in 1907 became the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy. The Boston School for Social Workers originated in 1904 under the joint auspices of Harvard University and Simmons College. The School of Social Economy, organized at St. Louis in 1905, had an affiliation with the University of Missouri and later Washington University. Only the Pennsylvania School for Social Service, created in 1910, was not originally connected to a major university. In 1913/4 900 students attended classes in these four institutions.[41] As civic-minded social workers trained not for "inner-directed" censure but for "other-directed" understanding graduated from such schools, cities and counties utilized their expertise by developing departments of public welfare. Kansas City did so in 1910; St. Joseph and Chicago three years later.[42] The emergence of a casework methodology helped social workers deal with the core concern of pre-World War I times, that of shoring up the generator of social order, the nuclear family.[43]

Students in many universities, unlike the bulk of their late nineteenth century counterparts, took considerable interest in charitable work with society's poor. Butler College students went into the Indianapolis slums to improve immigrant living conditions. University of Michigan, Northwestern University, and University of Chicago scholars maintained different settlement houses in three impoverished Chicago districts. Their contemporaries at the University of Wisconsin conducted social action programs in a Milwaukee neighborhood, while Harvard instructors and students taught cooperative philosophy to men from the Boston tenements. In Cincinnati, after 1899, students cared for the needs of 750 persons a week at the University Settlement House located on West Liberty Street, striving to make that building a "place of refuge from the dens of vice."[44] City College political science seniors gave lectures in the settlement houses on economic problems, volunteered for Big Brother work in the city, and assisted both the YMCA and Young Men's Hebrew Association. New York University graduate students learned the details of city administration at a "Government House" in New York City, then went out into the community to form clubs among the poor which could study the operation of local government. Students made contact with 25 different clubs, including one composed of juvenile gang leaders.[45]

University administrators open endorsement of the service theme undoubtedly fed into student zeal to work among the poor. City College President John Huston-Finley, as one example, talked frequently in his baccalaureate addresses about the benefits of "touching the life of the City every day through the home and neighborhood out of which you come every morning and to which you go back every night, and then of sending you back with a mind inured to serious thought, inspired of the noblest examples of living, to improve the very conditions on which you have yourselves been surrounded."[46] When Finley told his students they were the precursors of civilization, his plea struck a chord of relevance that could hardly be ignored.

Student organizations reflected the concerns of Progressive organicism. Good Government, Civic, and Sociology Clubs proliferated at urban institutions of higher education. At Harvard alone between 1905 and 1915 students formed the Harvard Men's League for Women's Suffrage, the Social Politics Club, the Single Tax Club, and the Diplomatic Club.[47] Examining contemporary issues to enhance human perfectability became a going concern.

The possibilities for university service to the community were conceived of as virtually all-encompassing, as events at the University of Wisconsin most appropriately illustrated. As early as 1892 the U. W. sustained research in the social sciences, a policy ostensibly designed to make democracy work more efficiently and one which would ultimately develop into a service program called the Wisconsin Idea. Faculty and administrators there focused much activity on solving state problems, supplied many of the specialists on state regulatory commissions, framed legislation for the regulation of corporations, and advised state administrators in the sciences, engineering, finance, education, and agriculture. The influence of university personnel became so great that in 1912 the Wisconsin Superintendent of Public Instruction warned that the university must be checked, lest the people have "a university state instead of a state university."[48]

Urban institutions of higher education adopted their own service variations on the Wisconsin Idea. Charles Dabney declared that the "social science department of the university may make itself, if not the organic, still the scientific and spiritual head of all the private as well as the public charity societies, directing their investigations, studying their problems, and training its students in the settlements, asylums, and other places where relief work is carried on."[49] At the University of Cincinnati, according to one neutral account, "Practically every member of the faculty has some part in the [community service] work."[50] There the social science department did organize a council of charities, as a clearing house for information, and conducted a "confidential exchange" with many charities.[51] The University of Toledo's Division of Social Service similarly aided and advised various social agencies within that city, as well as the courts and city departments.[52] Judge Lytle of Akron brought sociology students from the new municipal university there into his court to gain practical experience by surveying the conditions court wards faced. The University of Akron offered specialized courses for scoutmasters, social workers, YMCA personnel, and teachers of "Americanism." The latter were to prepare immigrants for naturalization.[53] John Huston Finley utilized his social service background in establishing a Social Science Research Laboratory at City College, one which worked closely with New York City's Department of Investigation and its Civil Service Commission.[54]

Some urban universities turned their attention to public service in the area of community health. The Anti-Tuberculosis League supervised by the faculty of the University of Cincinnati's medical college cooperated with the city's health board in treating 20,000 cases of disease each year. The university established a fund for the distribution of free ice and low-cost milk to needy persons. Physicians and nurses at several university branch clinics instructed mothers in child care and feeding.[55] Akron's Department of Biology offered specialized public health training to community workers.[56] The University of Toledo in 1915 created Public Health Laboratories with the objective "to secure, organize, formulate, and furnish in usable or readable form facts or scientific and technical information, which may be requested by citizens, school authorities, or other officials." These laboratories focused on public health administrative and prophylactic measures, research in bacteriology and physiological chemistry, diagnostic pathological service, and the instruction of advanced university students. City College conducted food inspections for New York City's Board of Health.[57]

Urban universities also made an effort to serve as the "brains" of city educational systems. At Cincinnati, Toledo, and City College psychological clinics were organized to investigate "defective and retarded" children discovered in the public schools and make contact with juvenile court officers with respect to such pupils. In Cincinnati this research led to the establishment of a special school for "defectives" and another for retarded or over-aged children.[58] The University of Cincinnati and City College provided extension courses for teachers (1906, 1908).[59] U. C. educators performed "scout duties in finding suitable persons for the city school service" and assisted the city school superintendent "in a manner similar to that of cabinet officers" in planning Cincinnati's educational policy. As William Paxton Burris, dean of the U. C. College of Teachers, explained, "in a word the municipal university is the only type of higher institution which can have adequate facilities for the scientific study of many of our most important school questions. With a sufficient staff of trained workers in this field, the value of the service which may be rendered to the city school system in this way is incalculable."[60] The College of Teachers, in cooperation with the city Board of Education, maintained a kindergarten training school. The Department of Physical

Education assisted in the development of playgrounds and in playground instruction for public school teachers, as did its counterpart at the University of Akron. Physical education professors also organized school contests to be held on the university athletic field. U. C. and the Board of Education jointly employed persons to instruct 100 elementary school teachers at the university's "model home garden" on how to maintain gardens in connection with schools.[61] At the University of Toledo as well the Division of Educational Research cooperated fully with public school officials.[62]

Charity work, health, and education were three overriding concerns of Progressive educators. A fourth, assisting municipal public officials, also received a good deal of the pragmatic attention of urban faculty and students. U. C.'s Political Science Department conducted a municipal reference library right next to City Council chambers--the result of a $5,000 annual appropriation from the city (1913-7).[63] The Public Service Bureau at the University of Toledo manned a Division of Municipal Research and Service, which gave assistance to city administrators and legal officials. (That Bureau also maintained the Division of Social Service and the Division of Educational Research and Service.)[64] Teachers in the Departments of Economics and Sociology there dropped their "academic dignity" to take charge of police classes in law, English, and psychology.[65] City College's John Huston Finley, believing that "Organized business and our government bureaus and offices need competent leaders, lieutenants and craftsmen who are also scholars," arranged for honors work with the New York City Department of Investigation and a course of training for civil service in connection with the Civil Service Commission of the city. City College professors wrote municipal ordinances, advised the Board of Health, and made recommendations to the mayor on matters concerning weights and measures.[66] In many other cities university consultants advised or conducted studies for the city waterworks, telephone companies, chambers of commerce, zoological gardens, and juvenile courts.[67]

City officials often shared Progressive goals about the value of scientific research and helped foster the university's public service activities by appropriating funds for specific projects. The City of Cincinnati, for example, allotted $4,000 to the university for the purpose of conducting tests on the metropolitan water supply, medical facilities, and other items vested with a public interest. The Bureau of City Tests analyzed over 1,000 samples of paint, asphalt flux, lead, pressure gauges, tar products, and brick each year. The University of Akron maintained a similar Bureau, which worked closely with the police on criminal investigations. U. C. received another $9,000 from the city to hold a variety of extension classes in the late afternoons or evenings at schoolhouses in the city.[68]

Despite their distrust of industrial bigness, Progressives considered commerce and factory production important to the unity and continuity of the urban organism. Accordingly, U. C., Toledo, and Akron began demanding not only that students take "scientific" courses, but also that they "put their book knowledge into actual application in city works, factories and industries." Toledo gave instruction in salesmanship and commerce at neighboring real estate and industrial firms. U. C. instituted a cooperative program--soon copied by Akron--so that students could alternate class work with actual shop work for wages. The student received college credit for such work. Over eighty Cincinnati businesses and many rubber companies, railroads, machine companies, and department stores at Akron cooperated with the universities in this plan.[69] U. C. also held evening classes under the auspices of the Cincinnati Chapter of the American Institute of Banking.[70]

Capitalists had good cause to support the cooperative plan. Tt provided, at Cincinnati, from 800 to 1,000 student workers each year--workers who could be paid a minimal wage and serve as insulators against union membership drives and strikes. It enabled businessmen some opportunity to inculcate business values into incoming students, especially a sense of the "practicality and competition of life."[71] Capitalists generally believed in a broad-based cooperation with universities as a vehicle for extending their influence and undercutting the development of Socialist or trust-busting sentiment there. Their interest in institutions of higher education was but one aspect of a larger interest in dominating school boards and participating in national educational organizations.[72]

Industrialists felt that university-trained specialists-managers could insure viable competition on an intra-and-international market. In 1906 Frank A. Vanderlip of National City Bank stated, "You know, as does every manufacturer in this nation knows, that Germany's superiority in international commerce rests almost wholly in Germany's superior school system," one which aimed at making "each citizen an efficient economic unit." Eight years earlier, Theodore Search, President of the National Association of Manufacturers, had called for courses related to the daily hum of American life, asserting "The classical and general literary studies have their place in all educational systems, but it is unfair and unjust to the great material interests of the land to leave out of account the obvious demands of industry and commerce."[73]

Businessmen pumped hitherto unprecedented funds into higher education. Henry C. Tremain left an income of $170,000 to City College's Student Aid Society between 1911 and 1921, an amount which established scholarships, supported the College Employment Bureau, and paid needy students for work about the campus.[74] Other men and women donated large sums to specific schools, departments, courses, and buildings.[75] John D. Rockefeller gave the University of Chicago $35 million before 1910, while Columbia received $36 million from several benefactors between 1903 and 1921.[76] Total benefactions to four year institutions of higher learning totaled $18,737,145 in 1909/10, including over $100,000 each to 25 private and two state universities. Columbia, Yale, Princeton, Chicago, and the University of California--all located in big cities--received over a million dollars apiece.[77] Philanthropists set up numerous foundations to assist higher education, usually on a matching funds basis. Rockefeller's General Education Board, directing the bulk of its activities at Southern schools, provided $10.5 million to 105 colleges between 1905 and 1914. By 1921 Rockefeller had given that foundation $118 million. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, formed in 1906 with assets of $31 million, supplied retirement pensions for faculty members at high quality institutions. U. C. received such funds from 1908 on.[78]

Although municipally-supported universities procured only a small proportion of the private funds earmarked for higher education,[79] they did expand course offerings in areas the "captains of industry" found congenial. Cincinnati (1912) and Toledo (1915) added Colleges of Commerce, answering the generally recognized need "for better trained men to conduct business enterprises which were rapidly becoming complicated and difficult to manage." Buchtel University, which would become the University of Akron, about 1903 founded a Commercial School, which provided instruction in shorthand, typing, bookkeeping and business, civil service, and insurance. Buchtel started a program of courses in rubber chemistry in connection with the many rubber companies at Akron in 1909. Those courses became the mainstay of the University of Akron's engineering department. New York, Boston, and Northwestern Universities went a step further, organizing departments or colleges of business administration.[80]

The establishment of evening classes represented one way in which the university could serve the business community by training employed persons in economics, mechanical drawing, physics, and mathematics. Evening classes created the possibility of quick advancement for many employees. U. C., City College, Toledo, and Akron began evening classes, and City College in 1907 became the first four year institution to offer a full collegiate course leading to a baccalaureate degree in evening school. Two years later 200 City College students were attending evening clas and that number increased to 863 by 1913. At U. C. the number had reached 560 in 1914

Both industrial and university spokesmen believed that societal unity could be best secured if institutions of higher education provided instruction not only for those who would manage factories and busineeses but also for those who would work in them on all levels. In 1906 the Carnegie Foundation, Chicago Institute of Social Science, Harvard President C. W. Eliot, and the National Association of Manufacturers jointly sponsored the creation of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, an organization which popularized vocational education.[82]

Both business and labor wholeheartedly embraced vocational training, even though NAM President John Kirby in 1911 claimed the AFL had about as much business in industrial education as "a tarantula [had] a rightful place on the bosom of an angel."[83] A study by Leonard Koos revealed that, comparing the years 1842-75 with those between 1909 and 1921, later published statements of college aims were twice as likely to specify vocational training as a goal of university education.[84] Even though one-half of all statements opposed university instruction for occupations below the preprofessional level, by 1909/10 one out of every twelve students--29,369 in all--was enrolled in one or more technical courses, an increase of almost 150% over 1899/1900. At least 100 four year institutions offered manual arts instruction in 1908/9, including thirty which had begun such courses since 1900. Forty-seven universities had manual arts libraries. The University of California had 926 manual arts students, Columbia 1,100, and City College 250. Even Charleston College, the classical school which instituted industrial education in 1902, had sixteen manual arts students by 1908/9 --no less than one-fifth of the total enrollment.[85]

Through manual arts courses, commercial instruction, evening classes, and cooperative plans, university administrators indicated their willingness to enter into an intimate connection with the captains of industry. Their belief that the urban organism's strength derived from the integration of its parts fostered a spirit of cooperation, as did the fact that industrial magnates had the **funds** necessary for curriculum and building expansion, monies which could insure that universities indeed could operate as the organism's brains. In so many ways, university life came to reflect the business example. Faculty clubs bore a striking resemblance to gentleman's clubs--the manufacturers,' bankers,' and brokers' clubs. University administrators fancied themselves "captains of erudition" or "school executives." Educators talked about college "plants," "product standards," and students as "stock."[86] The professor worked out of "a little place he calls his 'office' with a typewriter and stenographer."[87] Universities came to measure production in tangible, quantitative terms--the number of Ph. D's on the faculty, the number of books published by university presses--unlike the more qualitatively focused nineteenth century institutions.[88]

University administrators valued healthy competition between cities and educational institutions as essential to the overall growth of the urban organism. In the struggle for national leadership and academic prestige, administrators added advertising specialists to the campus "plant," pretended to give good value to their customers, offered business openings to their patrons, and began graduate departments. By 1911 the Carnegie Foundation would declare,[89]

> In no other civilized country do the institutions of higher learning compete for students. Nowhere else are the allurements and advantages of the colleges' training so advertised before the eyes of young men. College education in America is a commodity that is sold somewhat after the manner of life insurance and patent medicines.

Borrowing liberally from the scientific management ideas of Frederick Taylor, administrators attempted to shore up the competitive strength of their institutions in a way reminiscent of the self-productive merchantile model of eighteenth century economies. As Taylor put it, "No great man can hope to compete with a number of ordinary men who have been properly organized so as to efficiently to cooperate."[90] Bringing experts--those "ordinary men of ability"--into academe, while at the same time producing a stock of students and publications, resembled the earlier merchantilists' penchant for attracting craftsmen into a nation to insure its cooperative self-sufficiency.

In fact, local universities tended to monopolize higher education in metropolitan areas by absorbing or forcing competitors out of business. Despite increased enrollment, the number of institutions of higher education declined from 998 in 1890 to 951 in 1910.[91] Between 1900 and 1910 the number of independent professional schools decreased from 274 to 256, while those maintained by universities shot upward from 247 to 329.[92]

Universities, in an effort to become the "knowledge factories" which could supervise the urban organism's intellectual activity, centralized the city's educational offerings within their walls. The University of Toledo became affiliated with the YMCA College of Law in 1909, absorbed the Toledo Medical College in 1909, and soon formed colleges of Liberal Arts (1909), Graduate Studies (1910), Education (1914), Commerce (1915), and Industrial Science.[93] The University of Cincinnati created colleges of Engineering (1904), Education (1905), Graduate Studies (1906), and Commerce (1912) and merged with the Medical College of Ohio (1906), Miami Medical College (1909), Cincinnati Hospital Training School for Nurses (1916), and Cincinnati Law School (1918). The city charter of 1916 placed Cincinnati General Hospital under the management of the university directors. Two years earlier U. C. had absorbed the School of Household Arts began in 1908 by the Cincinnati Kindergarten Association.[94] At Louisville the municipally-supported schools of medicine and law after 1907 no longer maintained separate budgets, issued their own catalogues, or charged separate student fees. In the same year the University of Louisville added a Liberal Arts and a Graduate School and eleven years later a School of Dentistry.[95]

Consolidation insured unity. But such consolidation occurred within an expansive, specialized framework. A view of the university as the brains of the urban organism required an almost amoebic division of departments. Departments of Political Economy became Departments of Political Science, Departments of Economics, and Departments of Sociology. The University of Chicago Department of Biology split into five new departments: zoology, botany, anatomy, neurology, and physiology.[96] The City College engineering course was divided into chemical, electrical, civil and mechanical engineering courses. New departments and courses were added with great regularity--Clinical Medicine (1896), Hygiene and Physical Education (1916), and Nursing (1916) at U. C., as one example.[97] New courses focused on the practical details of community life--courses such as

"Municipal Organization and Management," "The Chemistry of India Rubber," "Home Planning," "Dietetics," "Lunch-Room and Tea-Room Management," "The Family," "Railroad Surveying," "Credits and Collections," "Labor Ethics," and the "Automobile."[98] Since Progressives utilized the press as an important vehicle for cleaning up society, many institutions began offering journalism courses.[99]

Curriculum expansion, coordination, and service activities added to the prestige value of universities both intrinsically and in terms of the competitive market. University administrators sought prestige and affirmed competition, but at the same time they made efforts to insure that cooperation between institutions existed as well. Sharing information and devising effective policy within increasingly complex institutions virtually required the extension of the organic metaphor into a national context. Between 1895 numerous conferences were called to examine various aspects of higher education.[100] Professional associations multiplied--the National Association of State Universities in 1895, the Association of American Universities in 1900, the Association of American Law Schools in 1900, the Higher Education Association in 1909, the Association of Urban Universities in 1914, the Association of American Colleges in the same year, the American Association of University Professors in 1915, and the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business in 1916.[101] Like sought like, revealing the Progressives' preoccupation with "managed" unity.

Some educators, disliking the application of a business model to higher education, thought such professional associations could serve as an effective counterbalance to the potentially dehumanizing effects of scientific managemnnt. U. C. Teachers' College dean William Burris exclaimed that the business mentality obscured "the few things which ought to be sought first in every child, and to which all other things necessary shall be added. No wonder the machinery...threatens to overpower with its mass and gathering momentum."[102] Benjamin Ide Wheeler tied nineteenth century paternalism to Progressive other-directedness when he asserted "that something must be done immediately to humanize the machine. Some adequate means must be provided to furnish each individual student with sympathetic, patient, stimulating, and widely informed counsel during the first year or two of his college course. Not more machinery, bigger equipment, smaller classes, more courses, nor even better classroom instruction will meet the needs of tens of thousands of students at that highly critical stage when they make the transition from the restraints and prescriptions of a high school and home to the all but unrestrained and ill-regulated life of universities which have neither dormitories nor commons. Such students ought to have the touch of a great personality, an elder brotherliness, along with stern discipline in straight thinking, in mathematics, or economics, and clear speaking in English."[103] John Huston Finley reiterated the theme that higher education must be student-centered instead of machine- or business-centered. He opposed ergocentric, or job-focused, education, declaring, "The idea of 'vocation' must not be ergocentric, but anthropocentric, not Ptolemaic, but Copernican,--a system in which *every* individual is a source of light, of divine light, though of varied spectra and spots, and not a soulless satellite revolving around a terrestrial world of salary."[104] Educators like Finley, Wheeler, and Burris bought into the Reform Darwinist view that education at all levels ought to assist the individual to develop to his or her highest possible state. For them, service to the individual student had become as important as service to society.

Administrators in other-directed times held that students deserved a measure of liberty and respect. At City College, Finley abolished demerit books and absent slips because they reputedly evidenced a lack of confidence in students, who he felt merited trust instead of suspicion. He swept away by-laws restricting student freedom of discussion and criticism of administrative policy. The president encouraged the activities of an elected Student Council, but not so much as "a body organized to express the sentiments of the students to the Faculty as a means by which their sense of responsibility as members of a self-governing community could be strengthened."[105] At U. C. student government was democratized. Before 1915 all student organizations sent a representative to the University Club, but after that date this body was superseded by the Student Council, a group composed of a democratically elected membership.[106]

The faculty also made gains. Finley allowed younger faculty members to vote on standards for staff appointments and encouraged academic freedom.[107] A Faculty Council came into existence at the University of Akron, while at Cincinnati Charles Dabney established a University Senate to assist him on matters of general policy. The latter body was composed of the President, Director of the Observatory, Chairman of the Graduate Faculty, College Deans, and one member elected by the faculty of each college.[108] Professors had less reluctance than their nineteenth century forebears to speak out on controversial issues. But their freedom to speak did have limits in these image-conscious institutions. Scott Nearing's dismissal at Toledo is one — illustration of those limits. So was the firing of John Willis Slaughter for advocating free love at U. C. (1904) and later of H. Heath Bawden for his lack of belief in marriage (1908).[109] (Dabney himself experienced sharp criticism for his support of municipal ownership of public utilities.[110]) Faculty members from many institutions in 1915 formed the Association of University Professors to protest against such dismissals and to promote tenure as a protection for individual professors.[11

From the perspective of college presidents and trustees, freedom must serve the interests of the total society. It must lead to civic progress before it could have real validity. Progressive educators glowed when students in a relatively undisciplined environment took responsible action, such as the U. C. students who started the University Cooperative Bookstore in 1907.[112] College spokesmen asserted that students—given their assumed immaturity—needed guidance, and the system of faculty advisors established at urban universities served that function.[113] Educators conveyed praise to those students who epitomized what the Progressive temper stood for: honor, character, a certain wholesomeness bordering on utter innocence, a tendency toward activity rather than reflection, and a finely honed sense of social responsibility.[114] Stephen Duggan, a historian at City College, indicated the extent to which other-directedness had become a positive value, when he declared, "No teacher could have had a finer student body to work with. They were studious, keen and forthright. They did not hesitate to analyze any subject to its fundamentals regardless of tradition or age.... *They formed the most socially minded group of young people that I know.*"[115]

Students became concerned about togethnrness. At U. C., for example, the Commerce Club was founded to create "a more intimate friendship among the students of the College of Commerce and [to] work for the common interest of the evening students." Another group, the Mummies, had as their stated purpose: "To help satisfy the need at Varsity for what we term 'dormitory life,' by forming a small club of college girls from all classes who, by uniting divergent groups and interests, will be able to promote a more harmonious and richer college life among the girls and bind them by one more intellectual as well as social tie to old U. C."[116] This was other-directedness at its finest!

Other-directedness had, however, its darker, negative side. Woodrow Wilson complained that colleges were becoming "side shows" where undergraduates demonstrated more concern over election to the right church or fraternity than over anything else.[117] Robert Morss Lovett indicated that higher education did have a homogenizing effect on the lives of students, calling it "the dominant superstition of our time." He believed it aimed not at truth but conformity and was no more than "the propaganda department of the state and the existing social syetem."[118]

Progressives talked about equalizing the classes by getting students together in "the old-fashioned democratic way." Some felt that this could be best accomplished in municipally controlled institutions, ones in which the public had more investment. John H. Finley in a 1912 baccalaureate address declared that, in current times, "The most obvious fact is not that the Almighty has made of clay all nations, but that mobility and transmissibility are making of all nations one clay." Education in general and City College, in particular, he believed, could make this "an age of victory over racial, national and provincial hatreds and prejudices."[119] The president's position undoubtedly appealed to many of New York's poorer inhabitants. By 1903 fully 75% of all City College students were Jews from Germany, Austria-Hungary, eastern Europe, and Russia.[120] At U. C. as well, increasing numbers of Jewish people began attending classes, as indicated by the formation of the Menorah Society in 1913 for the "study and advancement of Jewish culture and ideals."[121]

The free tuition policy pursued at Toledo, Akron, Cincinnati, and City College drew many working class people into classes.[122] In 1915 Akron reported that nearly all of the male students had jobs while they attended college. Many of these admitted they would not have been able to afford a college education outside of the city.[123] A survey of U. C. students in the Colleges of Liberal Arts, Engineering, and Medicine revealed that there nearly 61% of those responding said they could not have attended a university outside of Cincinnati. Thirty per cent of the women students and 85.5% of the men had worked before coming to college. Significantly, more of their fathers worked in the "Manufacturing and Mechanical Pursuits" than in the "Professions." In the evening classes, the former group outnumbered the latter by 2½ to one. Two-thirds of all students came from households with an annual average income of less than $2,500, and 44.9% fell below $1,500. Only 20.9% of them had a college-educated mother or father. Even though the professionals were overrepresented, in terms of their numbers in the Cincinnati population, and the factory workers underrepresented, there were enough poor students to justify one enthusiast's exclamation that "the University of Cincinnati has really put the higher and the professional education within the reach of all worthy students in the field, whether rich or poor, the sons or daughters of educated or professional fathers, or of uneducated, laboring men. [The fathers of 28 students were laborers.] It has democratized the higher education for the people of a city as never before."[124]

Chart # 1--OCCUPATIONS OF FATHERS OF UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI STUDENTS, 1912

Occupation	Number of Students in Lib. Arts, Engineering, and Medicine Colleges	Percentage	Number of students in Evening Classes of Liberal Arts College	Percentage
1. Trades & Transportation	228	33.4%	83	35.78%
2. Manufacturing or Mechanical Pursuits	173	25.4%	83	35.78%
3. Professions	150	22.0%	32	13.79%
4. Domestic & Personal Service	59	8.7%	17	7.33%
5. Agricultural Pursuits	38	5.6%	17	7.33%
6. Day Laborers	28	4.1%	--	-----
7. Miscellaneous	6	.9%	--	-----
	682		232	

Total	Students	Percentage	N Workers in Cinti, 1910	%
1.	311	34.0%	40,714	23.62%
2.	256	28.0%	75,852	44.00%
3.	182	19.9%	8,871	5.15%
4.	76	8.3%	26,318	15.27%
5.	55	6.0%	1,439	.83%
6.	28	3.1%	-------	-----
7.	6	.7%	19,179	11.13%
	914		172,373	

The municipal universities had indeed democratized higher education. Although the Commissioner of Education, P. P. Claxton, in 1914 called for free education at all grades[125] and some state universities had offered free tuition from the nineteenth century on, only the municipal university by virtue of its urban location could effectively draw poorer students into higher education. They simply could not afford to attend the state universities where their living expenses would be increased by residence away from home. State universities, because of their non-urban locations, could not rely on a local enrollment. Nor could private urban institutions, with their high tuitions, attract many students of non-professional or non-business backgrounds. Only the municipal university could do that.

As a result, the enrollment at municipal universities expanded more rapidly than the student population as a whole. Toledo's student body numbered 634 in

1914/5, 1,089 in 1916/7, and fully 2,448 in 1919/20.[126] Akron, with only 133 students in 1909/10 boomed to 1,019 a decade later. U. C. climbed steadily from 1,483 in 1899/1900 to 1,621 enrollees in 1909/10, then shot upward to 3,435 in 1919/20. Over the same time span, at City College the 1,808 students became first 4,430 and an astounding 10,740 by 1919/20. The University of Louisville surged from 216 students in 1899/1900 to 848 ten years later, before running into financial difficulties and suffering a decline to 668 in the next decade. However, the threefold growth between 1899/1900 and 1919/20 exceeded that of higher education as a whole.[127] Nationally, a total of 634,322 students attended classes in 1919/20, a number up from the 277,322 of 1899-1900 and the 342,555 of 1909/10.[128] Over that twenty year span the number of students was increasing 4.8 times faster than the number of persons of college age, but enrollments at municipally-funded institutions shot upward 26.5 times faster than the number of college-aged persons.[129]

The age of the municipal university had arrived. As P. P. Claxton predicted, "City after city, in rapid succession, will establish or develop some institution to serve it in this capacity. Probably within a quarter of a century most cities of 200,000 people and over, and some even smaller, will have such institutions at the head of their systems of education, organizing all other agencies, directing their energies, and inspiring the people to strive for higher and better things."[130] Accordingly, Louisville (1907) and Toledo (1909) took over control of the private colleges those cities had previously helped to maintain. Akron assumed control over the faltering Buchtel College (1913). Chicago, St. Louis, and Holton, Kansas, founded normal schools under the supervision of city boards of education. Atlanta provided an annual appropriation of $10,000 to the Georgia State School of Technology.[13 To reach more potential students, municipal universities established evening and summer classes. City College, in fact, by 1918 ranked first in the number of men enrolled in summer school, with 1,861, and ranked fifth in total summer school students, behind Columbia, Chicago, California, and the State Normal School of Emporia, Kansas.[132] Local initiative had much to do with the creation of municipal institutions and curriculum expansion, but the ultimate supervision over such universities remained in the hands of the community's wealthier members. With the exception of those cities who maintained normal schools under the control of elected boards of education, no provision was made for the direct election of the trustees who ran municipal institutions. In New York City, both City College (1900) and its female counterpart, Hunter College (1915), were removed from control by the board of education and placed under separate boards, the membership of which was appointed by the mayor.[133]

Local initiative in higher education and the movement to provide free schooling to all comers received a shot in the arm as the result of the discussion focusing around a new development--the junior college. In Progressive as well as earlier times, university administrators believed that not everyone could handle the college regimen. When "weak and struggling" students were admitted to the universities, it was believed by many that these would "promptly find themselves unable to keep the pace of their fellows;...flounder and fall; and as a rule [be] forced out in one or two semesters disheartened by their experience."[134] Some educators added that a large university, even if community-centered, was too impersonal to deal very effectively with the needs of incoming freshmen.[135] Other educators highlighted the professional and research functions of universities, arguing that if such institutions were to serve as society's brains they ought not to be encumbered by "secondary work"--that "preliminary preparation for the pursuit of special professional, that is, scientific, study."[136] Both groups favored the creation of two year junior colleges as "isthmian" institutions or "shock absorbers" which could enable students to make the transition from "high school restrictions and methods to university freedom and independence."[137] Reflecting the current assumption that higher education ought to be individualized, the junior college came to be viewed as the next step upward in the progressive evolution of the school system from kindergarten to common school to high school.[138]

Whether they considered it a relief institution for the university or a necessary alternative to it, urban educators fought for legislative recognition of the junior college. When John Huston Finley in 1913 resigned as City College President, he called for the creation of junior colleges in one or more of New York City's boroughs.[139] As early as 1892 at the University of Chicago, President William Rainey Harper had converted freshmen and sophomore classes into a division he originally called "Academic" and, later, "junior college." Harper negotiated agreements with large high schools in the Chicago area to accept as juniors at the university any students of academic promise who had completed an extra two years of secondary school studies equivalent to the first half of an undergraduate curriculum. By 1904 between twenty and thirty high schools had established six-year courses of study. In 1902 the Joliet Board of Education responded positively to Harper's suggestion that a two year institution of higher education be establish in connection with the high school. Goshen, Indiana, and several other cities near Chicago at about the same time also established junior colleges, but had difficulty procuring the necessary funds and, with the exception of the school at Joliet, all of these folded.[140]

Other university sponsorship of junior colleges bore better fruit. In conjunc tion with several labor groups, Stanford University and the University of California played an instrumental role in establishing the most efficient and earliest state-wide system of public junior colleges. Sixteen two year institutions were founded in California between 1910 and 1916.[141] Laws enacted by the state legislature in 1907 and 1917 provided for their establishment and maintenance.[142] Similarly, University of Kansas spokesmen drummed up support for the junior college idea in that state, resulting in the passage of a 1917 law which required a local election prior to the creation of a junior college, authorized a special tax levy to support it, and gave the State Board of Education power to prescribe the course of study.[143] Between 1902 and 1909 four junior colleges were established in America, and that figure hit 65 in the next decade.[144]

Despite the interest generated around the junior college idea, manual arts courses, and the expansion of educational opportunities, most university administrators outside of the municipal institutions did not design their curricular offerings in such a way as to bring in very many of the immigrants or other poor whites. In his study of college aims as specified in the available educational literature, Leonard Koos discovered that nearly one-half of all sources opposed the university's training students for occupations below the preprofessional level.[145] The classical colleges, in particular, waged a strong battle against the elective system, which they felt contributed to the degeneration of universities into mere service stations for commercial, industrial, and agricultural enterprises.[146] These institutions did not give up their aristocratic pretensions easily. Indeed, the numbers of students in classical studies increased from 13.58 to 17.10% of the total. The students in engineering and agriculture jumped twofold, while those in liberal arts and commercial curricula decreased significantly. (Compare Chart # 2 on this page with data on pp. 14-5 for a more complete description of changes occurring between 1899/1900 and 1909/10.) Nationally, students in professional programs accounted for 47.70% of the total. **Charleston and City Colleges, however,** lacked such a program and J. C. and Toledo enrolled only 19% and 10.79% of their students, respectively, in professional courses in 1909/10.[147]

CHART # 2--NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN VARIOUS PROGRAMS, 1909/10

Professional	163,388	47.70%	Classical	58,576	17.10%
Teaching	96,034		Engineering	30,337	8.87%
Medicine	21,394		General Sciences	11,163	3.26%
Law	19,567		Graduate School	10,498	3.06%
Theology	11,012		Music	10,123	2.96%
Dentistry	6,439		Agriculture	7,372	2.15%
Pharmacy	6,226		Commerce	6,249	1.82%
Veterinary	2,716		Art	4,520	1.32%
			Household Economy	2,765	.81%

As in the late nineteenth century, college and university students tended to come from society's upper echelons. About one-half of their fathers held positions as professionals or proprietors, a proportion double that of students enrolled in municipal universities and high schools. At the other end of the social scale, one-fifth of all high school students' fathers engaged in manual labor, three times the percentage of such fathers with offspring in attendance at colleges and universities.[148] Only at municipal institutions of higher education did the proportion of students at various social class levels **more closely parallel** the proportion in the high schools. Although the number of students enrolled in colleges and universities nationally increased by more than 150% between 1899/1900 and 1919/20, in the latter year they still constituted only 6.84% of all college age persons. (That percentage remained constant, at 3.78%, between 1899/1900 and 1909/10.)

Certain groups of young persons made few, if any, gains in the first two decades of the twentieth century. Opportunities of women remained at essentially the same level in 1909/10 as in 1899/1900. Women comprised 39.57% of all enrolled students at the turn of the century, a figure almost exactly the same as the 39.62% of 1909/10. The bulk of these continued to study a teaching curriculum—46.40% in the former and 56.16% in the latter year. They outnumbered men in this field by a 2-1 margin at the century's inception and by 3-1 a decade later. Women also outnumbered men in art, music, household economy, and classics courses. In 1909/10 these five courses enrolled 85.87% of all female students, but just 26.82% of all males. Few women received any kind of professional training other than teaching. They numbered only 4.46% of all students in theology schools, 3.30% of prospective doctors, and 1.05% of lawyer-trainees. The percentage of women in veterinary or engineering courses was even less—.04 and .03%.

Women were educated for low status jobs. While the number of women in medical schools decreased by one-half between 1899/1900 and 1909/10—from 1,456 to 707—those in the less prestigious nurses training courses increased threefold—from

11,164 to 32,636.[149] If a woman wished to seek classroom preparation for any industrial job, her options were limited. Many institutions did not allow women admission to their manual arts courses. (Only one out of every four "industrial" students was female.)[150] Just one municipal university, Akron, permitted women to participate in the cooperative plan with local industries, through which they might have been able to secure on-the-job training and money to cover their living expenses.[151] Even the major women's colleges provided a rather limited curriculum. At Radcliffe, as one example, 78% of all students were enrolled in language, literature, fine arts, and music courses and only 6% in the few natural science offerings.[152]

Despite increasing numbers of women in the labor force, colleges discriminated against the weaker sex in many different ways. Limiting certain courses to men became one means of discrimination. Constricting the availability of scholarship funds became another. In 1890, out of financial aid funds amounting to $560,000, less than 10% were earmarked specifically for women and members of the "weaker sex" could compete with men for just 24% of the remainder. Those proportions remained essentially the same over the next two decades.[153] The decrease in the percentage of women enrolled in medical, law, pharmacy, and dental schools between 1900 and 1910 may have been due, in part, to the inavailability of scholarships.

Several urban colleges and universities instituted discrimination policies designed to separate the sexes or to limit the number of women who could enroll. Citing the "attendant social distractions" of big city life and the "comparative youth of the students," President Harper of the University of Chicago in 1902 ordered the instruction of boys and girls in separate classes. Leland Stanford University limited the number of female students to no more than 500 at any one time because Stanford, the institution's premier benefactor, had wished the university to focus on technical and graduate offerings. Stanford spokesmen argued that their action reflected no anti-female prejudice, but failed to explain why, then, they had not instead limited the number of students who could enroll in non-technical and undergraduate departments. The trustees of Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut, declared that women could comprise no more than one-fifth of the student body there. Wesleyan ended coeducation altogether in 1909.[154]

Municipal universities, so Progressive in many respects, indicated little interest in woman's education. Although the "weaker sex" comprised a majority of the student body at U. C. and 70.66% at Toledo, only three and two young ladies, respectively, were enrolled in the professional courses (1909/10). In the University of Louisville, one out of every eleven students was female but none of those studied at a professional curriculum. City College did admit women into the summer school classes, but Charleston College remained all-male. Two petitions of female teachers and women's club members (1903, 1917) requested partial or total coeducation at Charleston, but the trustees rejected both.[155]

Although women's rights was a hotly debated issue before World War I, it generated little interest on municipal campuses. The College Equal Suffrage League, organized in 1909 at U. C. "to promote equal sentiment among college men and women," lasted just a year. The Women's Leagues formed on many campuses concentrated on the other-directed goal of promoting "friendship among the women of the university" instead of on advocacy of female causes. An occasional woman could achieve recognition as editor-in-chief of the school newspaper or valedictorian, but the great majority of prizes went to males.[156]

CHART # 3--NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF FEMALE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN VARIOUS COURSES, 1899/1900 and 1909/10

Course	N Women 1899/1900	%	% of Students in That Course	N Women 1909/10	%	% of Students in That Cours
Teaching	50,918	46.40%	64.36%	73,496	54.16%	76.53%
Classics	------	------	------	30,095	22.18%	51.38%
Music	9,092	8.23%	59.42%	6,972	5.14%	68.88%
Art	2,107	1.91%	------	3,335	2.46%	73.78%
General Science	----	------	------	2,939	2.17%	26.35%
Household Economy	---	------	------	2,636	1.94%	95.35%
Commerce	3,834	3.49%	26.24%	1,488	1.10%	23.81%
Medicine	1,456	1.33%	5.77%	707	.52%	3.30%

Theology	181	.16%	2.26%	491	.36%	4.46%
Agriculture	---	----	-----	362	.27%	4.91%
Pharmacy	196	.18%	4.85%	289	.21%	4.64%
Law	151	.14%	1.21%	205	.15%	1.05%
Dentistry	160	.15%	2.02%	93	.07%	1.44%
Engineering	----	-----	-----	8	.01%	.03%
Veterinary	----	----	-----	1	.00%	.04%
Graduate Sch	2,307*	2.10%	31.24%	2,992	2.20%	29.42%
	109,748		39.57%	135,711		39.62%

Despite Progressive discussions of the "democratizing" function of higher education, the de facto discrimination practiced against women revealed that, in some respects, Conservative Darwinist thought remained strong. The treatment extended Blacks and native Americans also suited a Conservative framework. Despite Wharton James' assertion in 1908 that American Indians had a good deal to teach the white man about hospitality, botany, frankness, art, diet, and child care, Progressive educators demonstrated no interest in bringing Indian students or teachers into the university.[157] The federally-sponsored off-reservation boarding schools represented an effort to "civilize the red man"--teach him middle-class values, instead of how to use his own more effectively in dealing with whites. Indian intellect was not respected in any profound sense, and therefore his/her "higher education" was limited to the industrial courses offered at Hampton Institute. That Black college enrolled 100 native Americans in classes before 1912.[158]

White northern industrialists pumped money into the several Black colleges of the South, but the funds went largely to industrial training courses and rarely into liberal arts or professional programs. Philanthropists kept the control of these colleges out of Black hands and cooperated with Southern segregation statutes. The quality of instruction at these institutions was not high, and 10,089 of 12,726 students in 1915/6 were at the elementary and secondary levels. Only four of 33 Black "colleges" offered professional courses.[159] In 1922 Black historian Carter G. Woodson would maintain that Negro education "has been largely a process of telling the Negro what some one else wants him to do and watching him do it in automaton fashion."[160]

Blacks had little hope of studying at a biracial institution. The Supreme

---

*The students in certain courses are not broken down by sex.

Court's application of the Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) doctrine of "separate but equal" to education on the Berea College v. Kentucky case of 1904 gave states and institutions license to exclude Blacks, either by law or tacit consent.[161] There is little record of any Black enrollment in the municipal universities. Neither Louisville, Akron, or Charleston College graduated any Blacks prior to World War I. At U. C. at least one Black received an undergraduate degree in 1886, as did another man in 1904 and four Black women in 1911 (three) and 1913 (one). Only one of the four female graduates participated in any aspect of U. C.'s extra-curricular life, while 95% of the White female students did so.[162] This handful of Black students apparently had no impact upon White students' racial attitudes. Illustrations and poems in the Cincinnati yearbooks indicate that students there viewed "colored persons" in very stereotyped terms--as big-lipped, carefree, fatalistic, musically-inclined individuals.[163]

Notwithstanding the growing acceptability of Dubois' "talented tenth" idea among Black leaders and the Niagara Movement's declaration that "college training should be the monopoly of no class or race in any section of our common country,"[164] urban educators made no effort to draw Blacks into their universities. In fact, if Ray Stannard Baker's impressions are correct, the conditions Blacks faced in northern cities and southern rural areas deteriorated markedly during the Progressive era.[165] Like the great majority of their contemporaries, Progressive educators could hardly afford not to follow the color line. Their "democracy" maintained its elitist flavor.

One non-white group, relatively speaking, fared well. The Chinese government's policy of sending eligible students to America for an advanced education met with the approval and cooperation of many urban institutions. By 1905 51 Chinese students were attending classes at the University of California, Yale, Columbia, and other schools. That number reached 105 within three years, including two dozen at Yale alone. These students enrolled in a variety of professional and technical courses, but only nine or ten studied at a liberal arts curriculum. They formed a Chinese Students' Alliance to unite "all Chinese students into an organic whole." The Alliance, three-quarters of which was composed of college students, had eighteen members in 1901 and 195 in 1908.[166]

Several institutions of higher education offered the Chinese special scholarships or tuition. Occidental College in Los Angeles gave a 50% tuition remission to attract such students. Yale provided two annual scholarships worth $100 each to Chinese immigrants. Columbia, Baylor University, and Wellesley College also offered two or more scholarships to Orientals. Harvard raised $10,000 in Boston for defraying the costs and tuition of Chinese who wished to cross the Pacific and attend classes at Harvard.[167] This all occurred at a time when members of minority groups rarely got any special treatment in their competition for aid grants. Perhaps the novelty of contact with these alien Orientals caused White administrators to put aside their racism for the moment. even at a time when the Chinese Exclusion League was active.

Despite its obvious limitations, urban Progressivism had left its impact upon higher education. The students in manual training courses were increasing five times faster than the total entollment. The junior college had begun bridging the gap between the high school and rapidly specializing research institutions. Universities had started offering more individual advisement than in earlier years. Urban universities had become intimately involved in community affairs, in teaching, settlement house work, health care, and charitable activity. Offering advice and research facilities upon request to increasing numbers of government officials, the university's highly trained experts had collectively become--to borrow a phrase from Charles Dabney--the brains of an organically unified city. Profound social divisions disrupted urban life in pre-World War America, and the urban university coped with such stress by providing local students with an integrated higher education so that he or she might step forth to solve the problems of a modern interdependent society. If things didn't work out in practice, such an institution at least prevented disillusionment and panic by offering urbanites the illusion that experts were scientifically devising new solutions for the concerns of a changing world. More than any other educational institution, the municipal university focused other-directedness in a distinctly practical direction, acting to create a new and dynamic concept of service. Nothing expressed the new attitude better than the motto appearing on the official seal adopted by the University of Cincinnati Board of Directors: *Juncta Juvant*--"Things joined are a help."[168]

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

[1] U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, The Statistical History of the United States from Colonial Times to the Present (Stamford, Conn.: Fairfield Publishers, Inc., 1965), 414, 139; Arthur R. Burns, The Decline of Competition (N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1936).

[2] June Axinn and Herman Levin, Social Welfare: A History of the American Response to Need (N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1975), 116-7; Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 (N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), 72.

[3] Axinn & Levin, 116.

[4] Ibid., 118; U. S. Commission on Industrial Relations, Final Report (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1915), 8; Thomas C. Cochran and William Miller, The Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America (N. Y.: Macmillan Co., 1943), 234, 280.

[5] Cochran & Miller, 233-4, 281.

[6] Richard Hofstadter, Social Darwinism in American Thought(Boston; Beacon Press, 1955), 170-200; William McDougall, Introduction to Social Psychology (Boston: J. W. Luce & Co., 1909); Edward Lee Thorndike, Educational Psychology (N. Y.: Columbia University Teachers College, 1903).

For the expression of survival of the fittest thought--"the strong concept drives out the weak"--in nineteenth century psychology, see H. S. Curtis, "Inhibition," in Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1900-1901 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902), I, 345-6.

[7] Hofstadter, 164-5; C. Vann Woodward, The Strange Career of Jim Crow (N. Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1957).

[8] Hofstadter, 121, 135-42.

[9] Quoted in Eric F. Goldman, Rendezvous with Destiny (N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952), 125.

[10] Edward Ross, Social Psychology (N. Y.: Macmillan), 1909), 252; Thorstein Veblen, The Theory of the Leisure Class (N. Y.: New American Library, 1963 [1899]), 137, 151-63.

[11] Hofstadter, Social Darwinism in Am. Thought, 113; Henry E. Jackson, The Community Center: What It Is and How to Organize It (Bulletin of the Bureau of Education, # 11, 1918), 15.

[12] L. Cremin, Transformation of the Am. School, 60.

[13] J. Axinn & H. Levin, Social Welfare, 122.

[14] S. Willis Rudy, The College of the City of New York: A History 1847-1947 (N. Y.: The City College Press, 1949), 298; Reginald C. McGrane, The University of Cincinnati: A Success Story in Higher Education (Cincinnati: The University of Cincinnati, 1963), 233.

[15] Frank R. Hickerson, "A History of the University of Toledo," D. Ed., University of Cincinnati, 1941, part. pp. 191-319.

[16] Ibid., 192, 252, 314-9.

[17] Woodrow Wilson, The New Freedom (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1916), 79.

[18] Education for the Immigrant: Abstracts of Papers Read at a Public Conference under the Auspices of the New York-New Jersey Committee of the North American Civic League for Immigrants, Held at New York City, May 16 and 17, 1913 (Bulletin of the

U. S. Bureau of Education # 51, 1913); H. H. Wheaton, "Recent Progress in the Education of Immigrants," Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ended June 30, 1914 (Washington, 1915), I, 425-54.

[19] John Dewey, Democracy and Education (N. Y.: Macmillan, 1916), 101.

[20] Don S. Kirschner, "The Ambiguous Legacy: Social Justice and Social Control in the Progressive Era," Historical Reflections, II (1975), 69-88; H. E. Jackson, The Community Center, 23.

[21] Kirschner, 71-3.

[22] John Broadus Watson, Behavior: An Introduction to Comparative Psychology (N. Y.: Holt, 1914).

[23] Charles Silberman, Crisis in Black and White (N. Y.: Random House, 1964), 250-1.

[24] Franz Boas, Anthropology (N. Y.: Columbia Univ. Press, 1908); Ernst Haeckel, The Riddle of the Universe: at the Close of the Nineteenth Century (N. Y.: Harper, 190

[25] J. Dewey, Democracy & Educ., 49-62; Randolph Bourne, Youth and Life (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1913), 3-27; G. Stanley Hall, Youth : Its Education, Regimen and Hygiene (N. Y.: D. Appleton & Co., 1907), 229.

[26] Frank E. Spaulding, William Paxton Burris, and Edward C. Elliott, The Aims, Scope, and Methods of a University Course in Public School Administration (Iowa City, Iowa: The Nat'l Soc. of College Teachers of Education, 1910), 13.

[27] Two baccalaureate addresses by Charles Dabney illuminate the role of the individual in advancing the social organism. See The University of Cincinnati Record: Commencement Exercises June 1914 (Cincinnati: U. C., 1914), 14-21; and U. C. Record: Commencement Exercises June 1920, 11.

[28] Saul K. Padover, ed., Wilson's Ideals (Washington: American Council on Public Affairs, 1942), 18-9.

[29] Carl Holliday, "The Municipal University," School and Society, VI (1917), 431.

[30] Charles Dabney, The Municipal University (np, 1914), 4-8.

[31] T. Cochran & W. Miller, Age of Enterprise, 271, quoting J. B. Taylor in the Educational Review (1900).

[32] Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 116-8, 211, 254, 309, 351-4, 366-7, 379.

[33] Leonard Vincent Koos, The Junior College (Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Education Series, # 5; Minneapolis, 1924), II, 359-60.

[34] Samuel Haber, Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era 1890-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), 104-5.

[35] P. P. Claxton, "Cooperative Methods in Education" in The University and the Municipality...(Bull. of U. S. Bureau of Educ., # 38, 1915), 24; Rush Welter, Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America (N. Y.: Columbia University Press, 1962), 245-50.

[36] Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency...(Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970), 46-52, 65-94.

[37] C. Dabney, The Municipal Univ., 14.

[38] Dabney, U. C. Record: Commencement Exercises, 1920, 19.

[39] Walter Crosby Eels, The Junior College (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1931), 68-9.

[40] R. Hofstadter, Social Darwinism in Am. Thought, 156-61.

[41] Edith Abbott, "Education for Social Work," Report of the Cmr. of Educ. for the Yr. Ended June 30, 1914, I, 345-59.

[42] J. Axinn & H. Levin, *Social Welfare*, 124-5.

[43] *Ibid.*, 140-1, 143.

[44] Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (N. Y.: Random House, 1962), 367-8; *The Cincinnatian, 1904* (Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 1904), 67; R. McGrane, *The Univ. of Cinti*, 180.

[45] Charles Baskerville, "College of the City of New York, New York" in *The Univ. and the Municipality*, 66; Jeremiah W. Jenks, "New York University, New York," in *ibid.*, 45-6.

[46] S. W. Rudy, *City College: A Hist.*, 275.

[47] F. Rudolph, *Am. College & Univ.*, 366.

[48] *Ibid.*, 362-3; L. Cremin, *Transformation of the Am. School*, 163-7.

[49] C. Dabney, *The Municipal Univ.*, 15.

[50] Louis E. Reber, *University Extension in the United States* (Bureau of Educ. Bulletin # 19, 1914), 15.

[51] *Ibid.*, 47.

[52] F. Hickerson, "Hist. of Univ. of Toledo," 328.

[53] George W. Knepper, *New Lamps for Old: One Hundred Years of Urban Higher Education at the University of Akron* (Akron: Univ. of Akron, 1970), 121.

[54] S. W. Rudy, *City College: A Hist.*, 462.

[55] C. Dabney, *The Municipal Univ.*, 15.

[56] G. Knepper, *New Lamps for Old*, 121.

[57] F. Hickerson, "Hist. of Univ. of Toledo," 327; C. Baskerville, "City College," in *The Univ. & Municipality*, 66.

[58] Hickerson, 327; Rudy, 462; William Paxton Burris, "The Responsibility of a Municipal University in Relation to the City Schools," in *The Univ. & Municipality*, 31.

[59] Rudy, 462; R. McGrane, *The Univ. of Cinti*, 200.

[60] Burris, 27, 31.

[61] L. Reber, *Univ. Extension in the U. S.*, 15; G. Knepper, *New Lamps for Old*, 121.

[62] F. Hickerson, "Hist. of Univ. of Toledo," 327-8.

[63] Reber, 47; *U. C. Record: The Service of the University to the Nation and the Annual Reports of Officers for 1918*, 73.

[64] F. Hickerson, 327-8.

[65] C. Holliday, "The Municipal Univ.," *School & Society*, VI (1917), 601-2.

[66] S. W. Rudy, *City College: A Hist.*, 275, 380, 382, 462; C. Baskerville, "City Coll.," 65-6.

[67] John L. Patterson, "Municipal Universities of the United States," *National Municipal Review*, V (1916), 553-64.

[68] W. P. Burris, "Responsibility of Municipal Un" in *The Univ. & Municipality*, 31; *U. C. Record: The Service of the Univ. to the City & the Annual Reports of Officers for 1915*, 70-1; G. Knepper, *New Lamps for Old*, 120.

[69] C. Holliday, "The Municipal Univ.," *School & Society*, VI, 546; R. McGrane, *The Univ. of Cinti*, 210-3; G. Knepper, *ibid.*, 140-1.

[70] *The Cincinnatian, 1917*, 32.

[71] McGrane, 213; Knepper, 135-47.

[72] R. Callahan, *Educ. & the Cult of Efficiency*, 6-7.

[73] K. Silberman, *Crisis in Black and White*, 251. Italics added.

[74] S. W. Rudy, *City College: A Hist.*, 413.

[75] Merle Curti and Roderick Nash, *Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1965) mentions many of these individuals.See also F. Rudolph, *The Am. College & Univ.*, 426.

[76] Curti & Nash, 124, 142.

[77] *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ended June 30, 1910* (Wahington: Government Printing Office, 1911), II, 848-9.

[78] Curti & Nash, 216-7, 220; R. McGrane, *The Univ. of Cinti*, 205.

[79] In 1915/6 only one of seven municipal universities received anything from private benefactors. That one, U. C., received just $8,840 out of receipts totaling $867,985. See Chart 12 in Lyle Koehler, "Municipalities and Higher Education: A Financial and Historical Overview, 1826-1976" (at U. C. Archives), 85.

[80] McGrane, 218; F. Hickerson, "Hist. of Univ. of Toledo," 310; G. Knepper, *New Lamps for Old*, 94-5, 120; Everett W. Lord, "Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts" in *The Univ. & Municipality*, 49.

[81] S. W. Rudy, *City College: A Hist.*, 313-7; McGrane, 182; Knepper, 94; Hickerson, 456-7; L. Reber, *Univ. Extension in the U. S.*, 35.

[82] *Report of the Cmr. of Educ. for the Yr. Ended June 30, 1908*, I (Wash, 1908), 71-2.

[83] Quoted in L. Cremin, *Transformation of the Am. School*, 52.

[84] L. Koos, *The Junior College*, II, 360.

[85] Henry Turner Bailey, *Instruction in the Fine and Manual Arts in the United States: A Statistical Monograph* (Bureau of Educ. Bulletin # 6, 1909), 136-57. Totals for 1909/10 are taken from tables compiled in *Report of the Cmr. of Education for the Yr. Ended June 30, 1910*.

[86] F. Rudolph, *The Am. College & Univ.*, 383, 409, 418-9, 431; R. Callahan, *Educ. & the Cult of Efficiency*, 71, 81, 215-20.

[87] Stephen Leacock, quoted in Claude Charleton Bowman, *The College Professor in America* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Penn. Press, 1938), 16.

[88] Rudolph, 395-6; L. Veysey, *The Emergence of the Am. Univ.*, 324; S. W. Rudy, *City College: A Hist.*, 285-6.

[89] Quoted in C. DeWitt Hardy, "The Higher Learning in America" in Hardy and R. Hofstadter, *The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States* (N. Y., 1952), 119.

[90] Frederick W. Taylor, *Principles of Scientific Management* (N. Y.: Harpers, 1911), 6-7.

[91] *The Statistical Hist. of the U. S. from Colonial Times to the Present*, 211.

[92] These numbers are produced from a count of such schools in the Commissioner of Education reports for those years.

[93] F. Hickerson, "Hist. of Univ. of Toledo," 167, 255, 243, 310, 457.

[94] R. McGrane, *Univ. of Cinti*, 141-3, 207-13, 214, 217-8, 241-2.

[95] *A Century of Municipal Higher Education: A Collection of Addresses Delivered during the Centennial Observance of the University of Louisville, America's Oldest Municipal University* (Chicago: Lincoln Printing Co., 1937), 7, 25.

[96] F. Rudolph, *The Am. College & Univ.*, 400.

[97] S. W. Rudy, *City College: A Hist.*, 369; *American Universities and Colleges* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1936), 286-7.

[98] C. Holliday, "The Municipal Univ.," *School & Society*, VI, 549.
F. Hickerson, "Hist. of Univ. of Toledo," 191-2.

[99] *Report of the Cmr. of Education for the Yr. Ended June 30, 1909*, I, 126-8; R. H. Eckelberry, *The History of the Municipal University in the United States* (Bulletin of the U. S. Office of Education, #2, 1932), 186.

[100] *Cmr of Educ. Report, 1909*, I, 62-8.

[101] *Ibid.*, 67, 92-3; Wm. W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer, eds., *A Century of Higher Education: Classical Citadel to Collegiate Colossus* (N. Y.: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1962), 248-9.

[102] Quoted in R. Callahan, *Education & the Cult of Efficiency*, 193.

[103] Wheeler paraphrased by Kendric Charles Babcock, "Higher Education the United States" in *Report of the Cmr. of Educ. for the Yr. Ended June 30, 1911* (Washington, 1912), I, 58.

[104] Quoted in S. W. Rudy, *City College: A Hist.*, 276, 357.

[105] *Ibid.*, 252-3.

[106] *The Cincinnatian, 1919*, 83.

[107] Rudy, 286.

[108] G. Knepper, *New Lamps from Old*, 153; R. McGrane, *Univ. of Cinti*, 199.

[109] McGrane, 205.

[110] *Ibid.*, 219-20.

[111] F. Rudolph, *The Am. College & Univ.*, 410-6.

[112] McGrane, 221-2.

[113] *Ibid.*, 231.

[114] Rudolph, 371-2.

[115] S. W. Rudy, *City College: A Hist.*, 293-4. Italics added.

[116] *The Cincinnatian, 1918*, 124, 220.

[117] George P. Schmidt, "A Century of the Liberal Arts College," in W. Brickman & S. Lehrer, eds., *A Century of Higher Educ.*, 64.

[118] Robert Morss Lovett, "Education," in Harold E. Stearns, ed., *Civilization in the United States: An Inquiry by Thirty Americans* (N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922), 83-9.

[119] Rudy, 276.

[120] *Ibid.*, 262.

[121] *The Cincinnatian, 1917*, 115.

[122] Tuition was free for local residents in liberal arts courses at the three

Ohio municipal universities. For engineering and professional courses a small fee was charged. Non-resident students comprised about 16-18% of all students and paid from $80 to $100 per year in tuition. See G. Knepper, New Lamps for Old, 135, 137; U. C. Record: Condition and History of the University in 1912, Including A Sociological Study of the Student Body, 19.

[123] R. H. Eckelberry, A Hist. of the Municipal Univ., 170.

[124] U. C. Record: Condition & Hist. of the Univ., Inc. A Sociological Study of the Student Body, 18-31. Occupations of Cincinnati residents appear in the Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910: Population, IV (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1914), 152-65.

[125] P. P. Claxton, "Cooperative Methods in Educ." in The Univ. & Municipality, 21.

[126] F. Hickerson, "Hist. of Univ. of Toledo," 475.

[127] Report of the Cmr. of Educ. for the Yr. 1899-1900, II, 1915, 1917, 1919, 1989, 1995; Ibid. for the Yr. Ended June 30, 1910, II, 889, 897, 899, 903; Biennial Survey of Education, 1918-20: Statistics (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1923), 333, 351, 357-8, 368.

[128] These figures, compiled from the Commissioner of Education reports, include all persons enrolled in universities, agricultural and mechanical schools, women's colleges, normal schools, and professional institutes. They do not include summer school or evening class enrollments.

[129] The raw data upon which these conclusions are based are as follows:

Area	N of Persons Aged 20-24			N of Students		
	1900	1910	1920	1900	1910	1920
Nation at Large	7,335,016	9,056,984	9,277,021	277,322	342,555	634,322
New York City	354,841	531,868	545,660	19,901	20,334	37,857
Cincinnati	33,814	38,968	36,196	2,812	2,327	5,026
Louisville	23,279	24,127	22,614	1,886	1,600	1,404
Toledo	13,023	17,169	23,595	———	900	979
Akron	4,825	8,649	32,450	253	885	1,052
Charleston	6,185	6,778	7,970	692	536	513

The student enrollment figures include municipal, state, and private institutions.

[130] P. P. Claxton, "Cooperative Methods in Educ." in The Univ. & Municipality, 25.

[131] L. Koehler, "Municipalities and Higher Education," 71-2; Parke R. Kolbe, "The Prsent Status of the American Municipal University" in The Univ. & Municipality, 16.

[132] Statistical Division of the Bureau of Education, Summer Schools in 1918 (Bureau of Educ. Bulletin # 31, 1919), 25-32. Nationally, the number of students enrolled in summer school courses increased from 118,307 in 1911 to 218,794 in 1914 and 298,219 in 1916.

[133] R. H. Eckelberry, The History of the Municipal Univ. in the U. S., 178.

[134] U. C. Record: The Service of the Univ. to the City & Annual Reports of Officers for 1916, 16.

[135] W. Eels, The Jr. College, 206.

[136] Ibid., 45-6; Frederick E. Bolton, "Some Probable Effects upon Higher Education Due to the Development of Junior Colleges," Educational Administration and Supervision, V (1919), 85-93.

[137] Robert Palinchak, The Evolution of the Community College (Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1973), 69; Eels, 209.

[138] L. Koos, *The Jr. College*, I, 5.

[139] S. W. Rudy, *City College: A Hist.*, 337.

[140] Eels, 54-5, 73; C. C. Colvert, "A Half Century of Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, XVII (1947), 244; Tyrus Hillway, "Historical Development of the Junior and Community College" in W. Bricker & S. Lehrer, eds., *From Classical Citadel to Collegiate Colossus*, 112-4.

[141] Hillway, 116; Koos, II, 652; Coleman Griffith, *The Juniot College in Illinois* (Urbana, Ill.: Univ. of Ill. Press, 1945), 170.

[142] Eels, 89-98.

[143] R. J. Hughes, "The Public Junior Colleges in Kansas," *School Review*, XXXVIII (1930), 450-5.

[144] F. M. McDowell, *The Junior College* (Bureau of Educ. Bulletin #35, 1919), 42.

[145] L. Koos, *The Jr. College*, II, 364.

[146] S. W. Rudy, *City College: A Hist.*, 320; L. Veysey, *The Emergence of the Am. Univ.*, 255-6.

[147] *Report of Cmr. of Educ. for Yr. Ended June 30, 1910*, II, 889, 897, 903, 899.

[148] Koos, I, 138, 140.

[149] *Report of Cmr. of Educ. for Yr. Ended June 30, 1910*, 1073.

[150] H. T. Bailey, *Instruction in the Fine & Manual Arts*, 148-9.

[151] G. Knepper, *New Lamps for Old*, 142. In 1916 Antioch College was the only other institution offering a coeducational cooperative program.

[152] Mabel Louise Robinson, *The Curriculum of the Woman's College* (Bureau of Educ. Bulletin # 6, 1918).

[153] *Report of Cmr. of Educ. for the Yr. Ended June 30, 1903*, I , 1071n.

[154] Anna Tolman Smith, "Coeducation in Schools and Colleges of the United States," in *ibid.*, I, 1068-9, 1073-4; *Cmr.'s Report for 1910*, I, 133.

[155] Statistical Div. of the Bureau of Educ., *Summer School in 1918*, 32; J. H. Easterby, *A History of the College of Charleston Founded 1770* (N. Y.: Scribner's, 1935), 189-90.

[156] *The Cincinnatian, 1910*, 199; *1917*, 102; R. McGrane, *The Univ. of Cinti*, 224; G. Knepper, *New Lamps for Old*, 100.

[157] George Wharton James, *What the White Race May Learn from the Indian* (Chicago: Forbes & Co., 1908).

[158] Frederick Webb Hodge, ed., *Handbook of American Indians North Of Mexico* (Smithsonian Institution Bureau of Ethnology Bulletin # 30, 1912), I, 418.

[159] Horace Mann Bond, "A Century of Negro Higher Education" in W. Brickman & S. Lehrer, ed., *From Classical Citadel to Collegiate Colossus*, 189-92; M. Curti & R. Nash, *Philanthropy in the Shaping of Am. Higher Educ.*, 174-5; *Negro Education: A Study of the Private and High Schools for Colored People in the United States* (Bureau of Educ. Bulletin #38, 1916), 12, 59.

[160] Carter Goodwin Woodson and Charles H. Wesley, *The Negro in American History* (np: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1972), 572.

[161] *Report to Cmr. of Educ. for the Yr. Ended June 30, 1909*, I, 238.

[162] R. McGrane, *The Univ. of Cinti*, 148; *The Cincinnatian*, *1904*, 50; *1911*, 41, 45, 53; *1913*, unpaginated.

[163] See, for example, *The Cincinnatian*,*1900*, 193; *1901*, 131; *1905*, 214, 219.

[164] "The Niagara Movement Adopts a Protest Platform," in Francis L. Broderick and August Meier, eds., *Negro Protest Thought in the Twentieth Century* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1965), 49.

[165] Ray Stannard Baker, *Following the Color Line: American Negro Citizenship in the Progressive Era* (N. Y.: Doubleday, Page, & Co., 1908).

[166] John Fryer, *Admission of Chinese Students to American Colleges* (Bureau of Educ. Bulletin # 2, 1909), 179-86, 198-217.

[167] *Ibid.*, 198, 205, 207, 213, 215.

[168] R. McGrane, *The Univ. of Cinti*, 197-8.

CHAPTER III: FRAGMENTATION AND ISOLATION, 1917-1930

The United States entrance into World War I diverted the nation's attention away from local, or communitarian, matters. Both the federal government and institutions of higher education talked much about the definition of the frequently reiterated but often ambiguous slogan, Americanism. They now only peripherally included "social matters" within the rubric of Americanism. Germans specifically came under fire in many areas, but interest in discussing and especially in assisting the various ethnic groups no longer commanded a large degree of national attention. Instead, Progressives on campus and off threw themselves into a more abstract preoccupation--"making the world safe for democracy." They had little time to devote to other causes. University of Cincinnati President Charles Dabney expressed the contemporary spirit when he lectured students in one baccalaureate address: "No class rules in our land yet, and you must see to it that none ever does. That is the next great struggle ahead of you. The Americanism your fathers fought for must be preserved in this land and handed down to your children."[1] In 1918 the section of the U. C. annual report entitled _The Service of the University to the City_ was changed to _The Service of the University to the Nation_.[2]

The war effort enlisted the assistance of university faculty and the university plant. The Creel Press Bureau used perhaps 2500 historians to justify World War I to the public. In fact, _most_ professors reportedly spoke on behalf of one or more of the "current spy-hunting and Hun-chewing societies."[3] On October 1, 1918, the federal government established a Student Army Training Corps at 600 colleges, including all of the municipally funded institutions. Curriculum offerings expanded--a course in telegraphy sponsored jointly by the University of Akron and the War Department; a Tire Repair Division in the same university which supplied practical training in the city's Goodrich, Goodyear, Firestone, and Miller factories; an auto mechanics course at the University of Toledo; and new subjects like military engineering, military topography, map-making, radio work, and aerodynamics at U. C. and other institutions.[4] Existing courses focused on the causes and issues of World War I, political problems of the war, and food conservation.[5] The War Department enlisted numbers of university psychologists in testing the aptitudes of prospective soldiers and government employees. Such an action encouraged hundreds of companies to set up their own personnel departments to administer similar tests to job applicants. New courses on personnel administration were added to university curricula, and in the five years following the war 2,750 volumes appeared on that subject.[6]

The centralization occurring in universities during wartime continued into the twenties. All major institutions established compulsory ROTC programs. Municipal universities continued to absorb existing specialty schools or created new departments to offer students a broad-based education. The University of Louisville introduced a Summer School (1922), the Speed Scientific School (1925), a Division of Adult Education (1928) and a Municipal College for Negroes (1930).[7] The Ohio College of Dental Surgery in 1923 became the Dental Department of U. C. Cincinnati increased intrauniversity centralization by merging the Colleges of Commerce and Engineering in 1919, the same year that The School of Home Economics was reorganized as a department of the College for Teachers.[8] U. C. took over complete control of the College of Education, which had been jointly supervised by the university and the Cincinnati Board of Education (1930).[9] Toledo in 1923 made the Colleges of Pharmacy, Law, Industrial Science, and Commerce into departments of the College of Arts and Sciences, then established a College of Business Administration in 1930.[10] Akron added a Department of Commerce and a Teachers College to live up to its self-styled "City of Opportunity" image.[11] At Detroit two small municipal institutions, the College of the City of Detroit and Detroit Teachers College, merged in 1930 and four years later incorporated with three other municipal schoold (Detroit College of Medicine and Surgery, Detroit City Law School, and the College of Pharmacy of the City of Detroit) as the College of the City of Detroit (later Wayne State University).[12]

In the two years following the 1918 armistice several organizations were created to accentuate a unity of purpose in higher education. In 1919 the Progressive Education Association came into being to define, once and for all, what Progressivism ought to be about. In the same year economists, philosophers, sociologists, historians, and even orientalists founded the ACLS, an organization which stimulated interest in the humanities. In 1920 the American Association of Junior Colleges was created to promote the growth of the junior college movement and to sponsor the professional development of its member institutions.[13]

The search for unity during these times was part and parcel of the post-war fear that alien groups and Communists might destroy the world's leading democracy. With militarist zeal, Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer rounded up and deported 556 aliens convicted of no crime and arrested 6,000 others. Italian anarchists Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti were executed for a payroll robbery, which many believed they had not committed. In an effort to limit immigration, Congress established a quota system through the Immigration Restriction Act of 1921 and the National Origins Act of 1924. The Ku-Klux Klan flourished, coming to dominate seven states during the twenties and claiming over 50,000 members in Akron alone. The municipal university cities of Akron and Toledo both fell under Klan control.[14] Several states enacted anti-evolution laws and loyalty oaths for instructors.[15]

Many believed danger lurked within as well as without. As people discussed trial marriage and divorces skyrocketed, conservatives demanded that the social atmosphere "toward foolish and frivolous ideals of marriage" become more "frosty."[16] They were outraged by short skirts and nudity in films. They raged at the sexual liberation brought about by the automobile and wanted to clamp down on the speak-easies which proliferated throughout the decade in open violation of the Prohibition Amendment. The use of marijuana by young Americans became a "national disgrace" which conservatives believed justified the first national narcotics laws.

The unity which pre-war Progressives had fought so hard to realize was drastically swept away by the events of this new decade. Many old tensions, temporarily set aside by the need for national mobilization, resurfaced in slightly altered form. Increased mobility, the result of a boom in automobile sales, made contacts with people of different cultures and different sensibilities more likely, with the result that confrontation increased as well. People began questioning basic American traditions as they participated in a relentless search for individualized experience. Immigrants from southeastern Europe and Blacks clogged the central cities at a time when America became, statistically speaking, an urban country. As one Southern newspaper editor put it:[17]

> We live in a time
> When cotton has gone west,
> Cattle have gone east,
> Yankees have gone south,
> Negroes have gone north,
> And we've all gone to town.

Conflict erupted between Black and White, immigrant and "100%" Americans, permissive and repressive theorists, evolutionists and Christians, rural and urban dwellers. No longer did the Progressive idea of the integrated, organic unity of society appear to make much sense. Indeed, as Henry May has pointed out, the 1920s served as a "decade when the fragmentation first became deep and obvious...a period in which common values and common beliefs were replaced by separate and conflicting ones."[18]

Despite the variety and intensity of innumerable conflicts, the twenties were a time of great affluence. True, farmers underwent a decade-long depression and Blacks worked at the lowest levels of the industrial hierarchy, but for most Americans a 53% increase in manufacturing output between 1919 and 1929 brought hitherto undreamed of affluence.[19] Between 1900 and 1929 the per capita GNP rose by 73%, assisted by the tremendous growth of two new industries: chemicals and automobile manufacturing.[20] By 1925 the United States was producing 55% of the world's iron, 66% of the steel, 62% of the petroleum, 60% of the cotton, 80% of the sulphur, and 95% of the automobiles.[21] Throughout the 1920s, businesses went on an unprecedented merger spree, assisted by the federal government's failure to regulate monopolies. Consolidations occurred in manufacturing, banking, transportation, trade, and public utilities.

In these prosperous times, union discontent decreased significantly. Serious strikes erupted from 1919 to 1922 in the steel, meat, coal, and railroad industries, but the institution of profit-sharing, pension plans, and stock purchases by employees at below market rates offered workers security of a new kind. AFL membership, at a high of over four million in 1920, fell off more than 25% in the next three years and waned thereafter. Although real power stayed in the hands of management, many firms instituted employee representation plans which gave workers some voice in matters relating to working conditions. No longer did "captains of industry" run the factories in a purely exploitative manner. The decentralization of power, caused in part by the increasing size and complexity of industrial plants and in part by the desire to ensure a greater degree of democracy after the war, meant that administrative experts replaced the earlier one-man operations. Concerned with "increased production of a better quality at a lower cost through the stimulation of the human element in industry," the managers of nearly 500 companies published employee magazines in 1925. Efficiency demanded no less.[22] These experts were so effective that "the overwhelming majority of the American people believed with increasing frequency that business men knew better than anybody else what was good for the country."[23]

Capitalists gave unbelievable sums of money to American institutions of higher education, monies earmarked for special research projects, many of which would ostensibly benefit the donating industry. Du Pont in 1918, General Electric in 1919, and General Motors in 1930 began granting extensive amounts to finance educational programs.[24] By 1922 between seventy-five and one hundred million dollars was being spent annually for research in the field of engineering alone.[25] Between 1923 and 1929 foundations appropriated $103,000,000 to private institutions for research and another $88,500,000 to 36 different universities and colleges.[26] Whereas in 1915/16 only one of the seven city-controlled colleges and universities received funds from private benefactors, by 1927/8 five of eleven such institutions did so. In the latter year Charleston College received fully 57.06% of its total income from private sources. The University of Louisville relied on such benefactors for 26.98% of its income. U. C. derived 25.23%, Newark College of Engineering 15.76%, and City College .17% of their respective budgets from the private sector.[27] Louisville, Charleston, and Cincinnati each netted more than $100,000 from private sources.

The funds served a variety of purposes. In 1924 Louis D. Brandeis began giving money to Louisville to develop special collections on topics of local, national, and international concern, then left $3,000,000 of his estate to the university at his death.[28] At Cincinnati four persons donated a total of $578,000 in the 1920s to establish a medical journal, a Department of Preventive Medicine, and Christian R. Holmes Hospital, as well as to endow a deanship. The Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations appropriated another $1,400,000 for medicine at U. C. Charles P. Taft contributed the money to erect Alphonso Taft Hall at the Law School and in 1930 Annie Sinton Taft established a fund of $2,000,000 in the memory of her husband to assist and endow the study of the humanities in the College of Liberal Arts and the Graduate School.[29]

Since industrial philanthropists supplied such a large portion of the funds utilized by not only private but also municipally-controlled institutions of higher learning, the connection between the two was even closer than in pre-war years. Businessmen looked to the university to train managers for industry, and the appropriate courses were added to curricula around the nation.[30] Cincinnati, City College, Akron, Toledo, and the Municipal University at Wichita maintained flourishing commercial and engineering departments.[31] Wichita, the Air Capital of the United States, organized a School of Aeronautics "because the demands by the aeroplane factories and other aeronautical interests assure the University of large practical laboratories for its students."[32] In 1922 the U. C. College of Engineering and Commerce began a series of lectures and discussions exclusively for business executives and professional men. There city businessmen were appointed as lecturers in special fields.[33]

In fact, industrialists sometimes urged community residents to set up municipally-controlled universities. At Wichita (1926) and Omaha (1931) one argument which enlisted popular support for the municipal takeover of faltering private colleges was the fact that large municipal universities would keep and bring money into the community.[34]

Nearly all of the trustees appointed to govern institutions of higher education during the 1920s were businessmen.[35] And they often selected persons with a pro-business background as university presidents. At City College in 1927 Frederick Bertrand Robinson, described as an "efficient and businesslike educational executive," became the college president. He had previously served as the Dean of the School of Business and Civic Administration. Dabney's successor at U. C. in 1920, Frederick Charles Hicks, had been Dean of the College of Commerce. Six years later, Herman Schneider, the author of U. C.'s cooperative plan, replaced Hicks.[36]

As the universities grew ever more larger throughout the decade, some decentralization occurred, often on the model utilized by industry. Presidents became largely administrators of finance and public relations. The faculty had important input into educational policy decisions, since they were the acknowledged experts in certain areas. Students were also included in discussions of university policy, although they, like the workers in factories, exercised no real power. Faculty performance was subject to review by deans, but in practice, the most prestigious professors were free to command their own sources of money and select their own staffs.[37]

Although universities cooperated with, and to some extent modeled themselves after, large industries, the alliance was not uniformly harmonious. Lotus D. Coffman of the University of Minnesota, in 1922 President of the Association of Urban Universities, lamented that "every university suffers from two types of competition--first competition with other universities that are looking for recruits to fill vacancies, and, second, competition with the business world." "It is not uncommon," he related, "for businessmen to discourage young people from entering teaching. They take them upon the hilltops and point out the multitude of economic opportunities that lie in the valleys round about. They paint pictures of power, influence and wealth. The young student, filled with ambition and influenced by the pictures, resigns all thought of becoming a professor and enters the business world." Coffman protested that industrialists granted money to institutions of higher education only for specific purposes and not for the general well-being of the institution.[38]

Universities not only competed with one another and business, in the expansive spirit of the times, but the competitive impulse also stamped events occurring within institutions. As different departments in factories vied with one another to produce more and better goods, so too did the members of different disciplines in the university jockey for recognition. The ego-enhancing emphasis on specialization, with its concomitant monopolization of expertise in rigidly defined areas, prevented much contact between members of different disciplines. Few people focused any longer upon the organic unity of the university's parts. At a time when social standards were often in upheaval and change a readily perceptible occurrence, most institutions shifted from authoritarian to empirical modes of perceiving reality. Nothing seemed constant any more except immutable and not always easily discovered laws of nature. Empirical thought provided a new method of studying natural and social phenomena and thereby provided not only new knowledge but also a limitless opportunity to expand it. And the more knowledge that was discovered, the more squabbles occurred over how to organize it. Outmoded ideas, it was widely asserted, must be shoved aside for new ideas in a new time. Organic concerns became less important than the desire to classify everything. The fascination for I. Q. scores, achievement tests, stimulus-response research in psychology, and cost efficiency studies all became ways to get the "raw facts" so that mankind need not rely on "hunches." As sociologist Wesley C. Mitchell explained, "The man of hunches may combine native shrewdness with wide experience, but he is an erratic performer. Sometimes he scores uncanny successes and sometimes he makes bad blunders. The man of facts is less brilliant but more consistent."[39] Indeed, *everything* must be systematized. And that could be accomplished only if the scholar pursued truth in a disinterested fashion. Any emotional involvement with one's subject matter diminis in the service of cold objectivity.

As fragmentation occurred in the world outside the university, so too did the self-encapsulization of the twenties produce conflict both between and within disciplines. Uncertainty about the purposes of the humanities sharply divided the ACLS and ultimately led in 1923 to the creation of the Social Sciences.[40] Sociology, now calling itself a science, split away from what was once a central function of it: social work.[41] Educators argued over whether their craft was a science or an art.[42] A general education movement took shape in many universities, purportedly to restore a sense of balance to the overspecialization of disciplines.[43] Some scholars complained that graduate education was "the most inhumanizing, fossilizing, dehydrating process known to man" and one which ill equipped the "Ph. D.-ocracy" for teaching.[44] While some faculty members and administrators literally worshipped science, others like Lehigh University Dean Max McConn attacked "Professor Germanicus," that "laborious, exhaustive investigator of some narrowly prescribed specialty--the Latin vocative,...the feeding habits of the bedbug, the jawbone of the ass."[45]

Many observers felt that life in the university was too atomized, mechanized, impersonal. As one Wisconsin professor proclaimed:[46]

> The student is admitted by thousands, registered by a vast clerical machine, assigned to courses, divided into sections, lectured to, quizzed, tested, examined; he is warned by his instructor, warned through his parents;...he is limited in the number of his semester hours, limited in his elections, limited in his "student activities," limited in his social life; he is recorded, card-indexed, filed, questionnaired, statisticized, and his documentation is kept in a safe.

By 1923, one Yale student could object to the daily tedium of seemingly irrelevant lecture courses with the words, "Instead of being a person...I am now merely a suit of clothes pinned together by four or five seat numbers."[47] Students participated in the sharp conflict taking place between the "specialist type of man" and the older type of the "cultivated man," a fight which Max Weber pointed out had accelerated because of "the irresistibly expanding bureaucratization of all public and private relations of authority and...the ever-increasing importance of expert and specialized knowledge." Weber added, "This fight intrudes into all intimate cultural questions."[48]

In the immediate post-war years, universities attempted to crack-down on any potential leftists by firing college professors assumed to be too Bolshevik in their ideologies, prohibiting outside affiliation for on-campus political groups, restricting the types of speakers who could appear on campus, and censoring the faculty's right to express liberal opinions. Students and faculty reacted strongly against such authoritarian measures. Various clubs changed their names from "Socialist" to "Social Science," "Social Problems," or other more euphemistic titles so that they could legitimately operate using university facilities. Underground student publications popped up on most campuses, including the short-lived Cynic at U. C.--a magazine suppressed in 1928 by the president for its "improper, indecent, and obscene humor." Across the nation, undergraduates and liberal faculty attacked compulsory R.O.T.C. programs as inconsistent with the spirit of a free university. Akron students formed the League against

Compulsory Military Training, which denied that any physical benefits resulted from forced drill, rejected the argument that R.O.T.C. taught patriotic citizenship, and emphatically asserted that "The underlying principle of military organization--unquestioning obedience to established authority--is diametrically opposed to the cardinal principle of a university: a free, untrammeled quest for truth." This group approached the Akron mayor for support, sought faculty endorsement, circulated petitions seeking student signatures, appealed directly to the University Board of Regents, and enlisted the aid of the Akron Ministerial Association, League of Women Voters, National Council on the Cause and Cure of War, the Y.M.C.A.'s, and the _Cleveland Plain Dealer_. Although compulsory R.O.T.C. was actively protested between 1925 and 1936, the faculty expressed their support of the program "with such exceptions as may be made by the [faculty] council from time to time," and not until 1968 did R.O.T.C. become optional. At City College the committee on curriculum of the Student Council in 1923 demanded that Military Science be placed on the list of elective subjects, a recommendation rejected by the Faculty in the next year. Protests followed, the student body voted 2,092 to 345 against compulsory military training in 1925, an angry administration brought pressure to bear on the editors of campus publications not to editorialize about R.O.T.C., and faculty committees were established to study the question. Finally, in 1928, after a committee recommendation to make Military Science optional, the faculty approved that measure. Within three years, U. C., in response to student opposition, also abolished compulsory R.O.T.C.[49] By 1931, only Akron, of all the municipally controlled institutions of higher education, had such a compulsory program.

The issue of free speech became another hotly debated topic on campuses of the period. Faculty members, no longer viewing themselves as essentially allied with administrators, spent much time and energy arguing in support of academic freedom, especially after the Red-baiting years of the early twenties. Students also stepped outside of the patriarchal mold to argue for freedom of the campus press. Throughout the twenties and early thirties, City College administrators were accused of censoring the student press, persecuting the Liberal Club, intimidating teachers at the College, and arresting student demonstrators. Concerned with maintaining order, the President and Board of Trustees decentralized the loci of authority by requiring that the Student Council observe the conduct of all student groups, appoint committees on discipline, and "eliminate conduct detrimental to the College's welfare." However, because it was too closely tied to the traditional model of the disciplinary institution at a time when people no longer believed in the legitimacy of orders given from on high, the Trustees' effort failed.[50]

Campuses increasingly atomized into isolated units. The confrontration between different disciplines, between liberal and conservative faculty, between administrator and activist student, and between advocates of research and teaching helped encapsulate sentiment at institutions of higher education. Cooperative dialogue, so much a goal during Progressive times, lost much of its importance. Many faculty chose to ignore basic conflicts by isolating themselves within that capstone of empiricism, the laboratory. Many students paid little attention to the rebellious element on the campus, instead directing their interest at football,[51] fraternities and sororities,[52] or "pure research" in graduate school.

Faculty members no longer reiterated the belief that society was an organic unit, held together by a brain which sent and received messages by way of numerous neural pathways. Rather, they focused mechanistically on the functional relationships between the parts of the entire culture and individuals within that culture. It was widely assumed that every custom, object, idea, and belief fulfilled a vital function, some task which was responsible for its continuance as a part of the working whole that constituted society. In the isolationist twenties, however, detail often became more important than design or meaning. In social anthropology, for example, the followers of Bronislaw Malinowski merely piled up facts about primitive people without having much of a purpose in mind.[53] Engineers and educators, according to Harold Rugg of the University of Illinois, "lived in one long orgy of tabulation. Mountains of facts were piled up, condensed, summarized, and interpreted by the new quantitative technique. The air was full of normal curves, standard deviations, coefficients of correlation, regression equations." Little attention was paid to what it all meant.[54] The new sociology had little concern for broad-based social issues, but dealt with how individuals behave in specifi social settings.[55] While Freudian psychologists had typically located the person in a generalized environment, a theorist like Harry Stack Sullivan discussed "particular" patterns of interaction as they occurred between "particular" people.[56] American historians turned away from the grand view of history to focus on local, specific category studies--The Southern Frontier 1670-1732, The Expansionists of 1812, The Maritime History of Massachusetts 1783-1860, Florida Plantation Records, The Party Battles of the Jackson Period, and many others.

The relentless search for knowledge, coupled with the erosion of traditional modes of perception, signified mankind's maleability. Man could become anything he wanted to, educators affirmed, as long as he was in touch with his deep-seated needs and proclivities. Freud had revealed that there was much more to human growth than previously assumed, and colleges began adapting curricula to the perceived needs of students instead of molding students to suit a pattern preordained by a society of the past.[57] Neither God nor centuries of evolution served to limit what could be done with the individual. As Harry Stack Sullivan put it, "The human organism is so extraordinarily adaptive that not only could the most fantastic social rules and regulations be lived up to, if they were properly inculcated in the young, but they would seem very natural and proper ways of life."[58] Teachers were urged to recognize unconscious motivation in their students and to sublimate repressed emotions into socially useful channels.[59] Environment was everything! And the most creative personality was, as social psychologist W. I. Thomas pointed out, one in which "the reflective acts constituting it include a tendency to change, regulated by plans of productive activity."[60]

To bring about positive individual change, scholars increasingly emphasized the need to experience the world. At a time when pure research was a priority concern, some educators came to realize that observing life was not living it. Educator William Heard Kilpatrick, for one, agreed that books were indispensable to learning, but asserted that the well-adjusted personality could only be achieved if "We learn what we live." The world teemed with answers and things to explore.[61] To emancipate the individual and develop his capacities, universities instituted a number of student-centered programs and encouraged each student, with the help of a faculty adviser, to take charge of his own education. Freshman counseling, freshman week, the hiring of campus psychologists, and the substitution of probation for expulsion constituted efforts to achieve that same goal.[62]

The tendency to focus on the individual within a community also made impact upon the higher academic studies. Educators conducted studies of their students to define those aspects of family background which contributed to college success.[63] In anthropology Malinowski urged the observer of mankind to come down off the verandah and study the natives in the field. Malinowski repudiated the evolutionists' historical treatment of societal development, stating emphatically that "All men are equal but diverse and all diversities are equal."[64]

Conservative social Darwinism had been turned on its head. Although the issue of mankind's adaptability had been heatedly debated from 1919 to 1923, after that date Reform Darwinism had clearly won the day. Few people listened to critics like President George B. Cutten of Colgate University when he argued that only 15% of the people had the intelligence to get into and profit from college.[65]

Most educators asserted that people started at different places and had different needs but institutions of higher learning ought to be able to create opportunities for students of varying capacities and sensibilities.

As a result, the student bodies of American universities were more heterogeneous than ever before. The number of pupils enrolled in college classes jumped upward from 304,991 in 1909/10 to 625,241 in 1919/20 and 1,193,317 in 1927/28. The percentage of college-age students actually enrolled increased from 3.78% to 6.74% and finally to 10.98% of all students between 20 and 24. Before the end of the third decade of the twentieth century fully eight of the ten municipally-controlled institutions of higher education had more than a thousand students enrolled. With 11,803 registrants in 1931, U. C. ranked 15th in the nation, ahead of such schools as Cornell, Harvard, and Chicago. City College, with 26,005 students, was the third largest university— behind only Columbia and New York University. Hunter College, the largest women's college in the country, ranked thirteenth at 12,161 students.[66]

Many of these registrants were working students who attended night school classes. A large number were adults, especially in the late twenties. By 1928 the National Education Association had formed a department of adult education and the journal Adult Education came into being in 1925. Many observers indicated that adults needed more education simply to keep up with the changes occurring in highly skilled industrial jobs.[67] Even a traditional classical school like Charleston College offered a "higher commercial training" to adults at night school.[68]

Blacks also made gains. In response to empirical studies which concluded that "the difference between white and Negro children in intelligence test scores tends to disappear as the environments of the two groups approach equality." after 1925 substantial state appropriations and large foundation grants assisted Black colleges.[69] Cities also allocated funds for a number of two year institutions for Black students--Sumner Teachers College in St. Louis (1924), Houston College for Negroes (1927), Myrtilla Miner Normal School in Washington, D. C. (1927), Coppin Normal School in Baltimore, and Armstrong Normal School in Richmond, Virginia.[70] The great bulk of the state and private funds went to industrial schools. Horace Mann Bond has asserted that Black liberal arts colleges "declined to a starvation level."[71] Contrarily, the cities endorsed the importance of liberal arts classes in the colleges there. Of course, the emphasis was on teaching--still virtually the only occupation for which Blacks could secure professional training. Only Houston College for Negroes offered a varied curriculum in arts and sciences, as well as special courses and summer school offerings. In attendance, that college ranked in first place, with 461 students. Just 1,109 pupils went to classes in the five municipally-controlled two year colleges.[72] And in the north, Blacks were able to attend almost all of the four year municipal institutions, although few actually enrolled. Despite the development of communities of Black intellectuals in northern cities--the Harlem Renaissance group is the best known--and their endorsement of a broad-based education for Blacks on all levels of the public school system, little effort was made by institutions to actively enlist Black enrollment. The Natinnal Association of Teachers in Colored Schools argued that Blacks must have education to prevent them from continuing to form such a large part of the country's unemployed.[73] However, a decade of depression in Southern agriculture, the segregation of Blacks in small colleges, and the institutionalization of racism throughout the nation undoubtedly deflected Black interest away from higher education.

Even after the enactment of the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution, women's rights continued to be an issue of some magnitude in the country, and one which made some impact on higher education. Although an occasional voice like sociologist Edward Ross might assert that an "inevitable by-product of the liberation of women from men, and of both from tradition, is a rank individualism which makes a lasting union impossible, and thus defeats the end for which marriage exists,"[74] other educators favored a broadening of educational opportunities for women. The result was that more women entered college than at any time previously--300,264 in 1919/20 and 574,821 in 1927/28. Another 264,338 females attended summer school, short winter, extension, and correspondence courses in the latter year. At that time fully 48.17% of all students were of the "gentle sex."[75]

The demand for women in industrial jobs during the First World War helped bring women into previously all-male schools and into "masculine" courses. At U. C. the small enrollment in chemical and commercial engineering courses convinced that institution to admit women to such classes. Both Charleston and City College, previously all male, opened their doors to the female sex. By 1927-28 nearly one-half of the Charleston student body was female. Still, despite some gains, women comprised a smaller percentage of the student body in municipally-controlled four year institutions of higher education--42.19%--than they did in the nation at large. Only at Wichita (47.98%), Charleston College (49.42%), Akron (43.22%), U. C. (41.17%), and Hunter College (100%) did women comprise over 40% of the student body. The percentage of co-eds ranged from 29.04 to 39.52% at City College, Louisville, and Toledo. Detroit College of Medicine, Detroit Law School, and Newark College of Engineering remained bastions of male privilege. The latter two excluded women completely.

Eighteen different communities founded city-supported junior colleges by 1927-28, and there women constituted just 37.32% of the students enrolled. However, the percentage varied greatly by locale, from a low of 24.10% at Crane Junior College in Chicago to 87.56% at the Houston College for Negroes. In eight of these two year schools women students were in the majority and in three outnumbered the males three to two. The number of women in attendance was not tied to either size of community or section of the country. Junior college administrators generally wished to attract female students, however, by arguing that at the two year school women could secure training as teachers, dietitians, nurses, and secretaries at a time when the "gentle sex" had begun to become career-oriented.[77] Many female students worked in banks, hospitals, and businesses in connection with junior college copperative programs, but almost always in the lower status occupations.[78]

Only in city-controlled normal schools did women make up an overwhelming proportion of the students. Fifteen of the 28 such institutions had no males in attendance at all. Overall, the normal schools were 94.79% female. Women had always constituted a clearcut majority in these institutions but this was the most extreme margin of all time. Clearly, by 1928 teaching had become nearly an exclusive female occupation. But only on an elementary and secondary level! Just 22.24% of all university faculty members were female in that year. Still, even that percentage had doubled in less than a decade.

Most women did not attempt to become engineers, lawyers, doctors, or veterinarians. Instead, 65.93% of them were enrolled in teaching courses--a percentage up over ten points from 1909-10. Although female graduate students were up to 39.91% of all such students, the percentage of women enrolled in professional courses actually decreased slightly between 1919-20 and 1927-28--from 6.71 to 5.82%.

CHART # L--NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF FEMALE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN VARIOUS COURSES, 1919/20 and 1927/28

Course	N Women 1919/20	%	% of Students in That Course	N Women 1927/28	%	% of Students in That Course
Teaching	133,647	44.51%	82.09%	378,982	65.93%	77.53%
General Collegiate*	128,677	42.85%	37.73%	292,977	50.97%	42.14%
Graduate School	5,775	1.92%	36.99%	17,625	3.07%	39.91%
Law	1,171	.39%	5.58%	2,216	.39%	5.19%
Theology	-------	--------	--------	1,348	.23%	9.88%
Medicine	888	.30%	6.24%	942	.16%	4.40%
Pharmacy	705	.23%	14.03%	762	.13%	6.85%
Osteopathy	--------	---------	---------	222	.04%	11.90%
Dentistry	181	.06%	2.05%	116	.02%	1.25%
Veterinary Sci.	1	--------	.11%	2	-----	.33%
Other	28,423	9.47%	45.68%	22,754	3.96%	58.12%

*Includes some Teachers

More poor people were able to attend college in the 1920s, most particularly at the mushrooming junior colleges. The percentage of students whose fathers were manual laborers was there more than twice as high as the percentage in universities and nearly equal to the percentage in high schools.[79] Public junior colleges in California, Kansas, North Carolina, and Arizona offered free tuition as late as 1931. In the nation at large, the average annual costs of a junior college education for local students averaged out to $126, compared to $286 at four year institutions.[80] The number of junior colleges shot upward from 52 in 1920 to 132 in 1924 and 248 in 1928, while the number of students in attendance jumped from 8,102 to 20,559 to 44,855 over the same time interval.[81] Beginning with just thirty students in 1911, Crane Junior College at Chicago had by 1928 as many students enrolled as all junior colleges in 1918. Four of the five city-controlled junior colleges in metropolitan areas of at least 100,000 residents had over 750 students. Crane ranked in first place with 4,050; Kansas City Junior College and Detroit Teachers College also had more than 1,000 students, while the average for the nation was only 170 students.[82]

Junior college programs catered specifically to a less affluent clientele. As early as 1919 17.5% of all public junior college course offerings were vocational in nature. These included mechanical drawing, machine shop, engineering, printing, plumbing, journalism, architecture, agriculture, home economics, commerce, and surveying. By 1925 junior colleges offered a "terminal" education in many different "middle level" occupations--pharmacy, optometry, nursing, salesmanship, accounting, public service jobs, and industrial foremanship. The percentage of terminal courses reached 28% in 1921 and 33% in 1930. The number of such offerings boomed from 100 in 1921 to 400 in 1925 to 1,600 in 1930. The age of the "pre-professional" or "technist" had arrived.[83]

The junior college had come into its own. Increasingly, junior college founders and administrators emphasized the exclusive,"vocational" nature of the institution. They pointed out that the anonymity of the large university offered the student little chance to develop his or her finest potential. Life in the surrounding community, with its supportive network of friends, relatives, and family, was described as more valuable than the mechanistic, alienating rhythm of university life. Junior college advocates asserted that the two year school could fulfill one of the foremost goals of Progressivism--education for leadership. As one supporter put it,[84]

> In the four-year institution most...positions go to juniors and seniors. In the junior college...responsibilities come earlier and more frequently. In the junior college the student may be a big fish in a little puddle, in the university a little fish in a big puddle. The junior college is more likely to bring out the latent ability of the backward student--the slow, the shy, the awkward.

Defenders could point out that nearly one-fourth of public junior college sophomores held some college office, compared to only 8.5% of university sophomores.[85]

Junior college adherents no longer viewed the university as an ally in higher education. Ties with four year institutions were disrupted as spokesmen from both large and small colleges described the different functions performed by their respective institutions. A. F. Lange stated emphatically as early as 1917: "A mere specialist may do great harm in a university: in a junior college with its man-centered aims his ways would lead to destruction. Normally a Ph. D. applying for a junior college position should be asked to present a certificate of rebirth."[86] F. Eby of the University of Texas rejoined that the junior college could never "feel the verve of independent being, and develop conscious self-respect. It will remain a poor, dependent, imitative, servile thing, trotting obediently at the heels of the higher institutions, and pecked at from behind by the high schools."[87]

Local initiative founded junior colleges in an unbelievable number of American communities. G. D. Stoddard lamented in 1930, "We are in the midst of an epidemic, no town boasting as many as 2,000 inhabitants and a strong Chamber of Commerce is immune."[88] In Iowa--to cite the most notorious example--local residents established ten different junior colleges between 1918 and 1927 and ten more over the next two years, although only two cities had more than the 20,000 people required by state law as a precondition for establishing a junior college. In 1927-28 the average enrollement at such institutions was only 56 students.[89]

The junior college well illustrated the fragmentation of higher education, for the institutions often had very little in common and rarely cooperated with one another. Although their spokesmen continued to advocate the organic unity of the community, that community ended at the town limits. And the junior college did not serve as a training ground for the experts needed to run society, but rather as an institution where common, ordinary people could learn the skills necessary to survive in a technological society. Nor did it attempt to "direct" community affairs. If anything, it was subservient to the needs of the community--direct*ed* instead of direct*or*. Only in a somewhat abstract sense did the junior college "serve" the city or rural community of which it was a part. More specifically, this institution "served," in a "man-centered" way, the individual development of the students who comprised it.

In this respect, the junior college was not alone. The larger universities lost the service goal as well. Concerned with the "pure" pursuit of knowledge, the university had lost the ability to "control" society, or even itself. It grew...and grew, without much conscientious overall planning or purpose. Just keeping up with change--let alone directing it--was a fulltime occupation. An inward turning absorption with expansion during expansive times had replaced the earlier notion of the university as an organic unit in an organic society. Cooperation became secondary to competition.

No longer did academicians consider the human condition to be completely and easily comprehensible. The moral rules which governed nineteenth century behavior had lost their applicability. To some, the twenties testified to the fantastic variety of nature and humanity. To others, everything had gone haywire. Evolution, in the broadest sense, had lost its predictability. Only the individual remained--not in the self-seeking nineteenth century sense of "I am the definer of and responsible for my own actions" but in a new "every person must be helped to achieve his/her finest potential" sense. Higher education, reflecting this new concern for the individual, shaped offerings and facilities to meet the interests and abilities of students through the collecting of adequate information, survey courses, counseling, plans for independent study, the tutorial system, and student selection of a field of curriculum concentration.[90]

The twenties tore the underpinings out of theories of human development. Freud had supplanted the Bible as the definer of man's condition. Science eroded the given "truths" of religion, but science was too much a method to relieve people's feelings of anomie. For purposes of security, people turned, much more than they did during the early Progressive period, to the peer group as a stabilizing factor. If answers seemed often elusive, the peer group at least gave the illusion of people experiencing change together. Attachment to the group provided a needed sense of order. Social theorists began to assert that personality was almost entirely the result of reactions to the lives of other people. Charles H. Cooley affirmed that each individual had a concept of personal identity that could be construed as a "looking-glass self"--a sensitized reflection of the reactions of others. George Herbert Mead argued that behavior was not a constant, but involved the adoption of different roles in different situations. Out of all these roles taken with reference to others' behavior, one develops, he said, a synthetic self or "a generalized other."[91]

Interest in social psychology expanded, and in group therapy as a balm for psychic wounds. J. L. Moreno, the man who in 1925 introduced group therapy into this country, developed concepts of "psychodrama" and "sociodrama."[92] Aubry Douglas pointed out that "students seek out the academic curricula of the senior high school, the junior college, or the college because social approval attaches to them to a very great degree."[93] College was no longer pursued merely for broadening one's horizons, searching out truth, self-improvement, or the veneer of elegance, but because one's peer group wanted one to. Of such pieces was security made. Even radical students saw the group as the real basis of power, as the Student League for Industrial Democracy and the Student Christian Movement could testify. Opposed to child labor, industrial strife, poverty, and war, the SCM enlisted about 5% of the undergraduate population.[94] Fraternities and sororities, very popular during the twenties, fulfilled a similar need for inclusion.[95]

While academicians affirmed that the need for social integration was the fundamental cause of social institutions, most of their concern and theory focused on the individual within a social interrelationship, not on society as a collectivity of individuals--on getting along, not on progress. Society, perceived as so diverse, could not become the basic unit of study. The holistic perception of reality had undergone profound change. Service to the organic community had ceased to be credible.

The ideal of service lasted longest at the municipally controlled universities. But even here the Dabneyian focus of earlier years was eroding. Parke Kolbe at his resignation as President of the University in Akron asked the university to "serve the community, extend the impact of the college to every facet of community life and need." He urged "more cooperation with civic and social agencies; better cooperation with local industry through cooperative courses, evening courses, and research in rubber chemistry," but that cooperation was in reality vanishing. He did not discuss the directorship function of the university at all, nor pay attention to how the organic connection between university and society could be maintained.[96] President Philip Nash of the University of Toledo opposed public appropriations for pure research and desired a close interaction between university and community. Here, too, there was no mention of directorship. Instead, Nash viewed the major function of U. T. to be the "making of better citizens," and the offering of professional and technical work in "fields that seem to be needed within the city."[97] At U. C. the war put an end to the university's broad-based involvement in city affairs. After 1919 the Bureau of City Tests lacked "intimate acquaintance with the various city departments" and no effort was made to repair laboratory equipment. Health work in the community ended. The Municipal Reference Library maintained by the university at City Hall was moved on campus in 1917, which meant that community access was de facto restricted.[98]

Throughout the 1920s, there were some similarities between the municipal university and the junior college. Both were subject to local control. Both popularized local access to higher education. Although the junior college trained students for pre-professional and vocational jobs in the community and the university trained professionals, both limited their service to that kind of individualized option. As a result, there was a closer connection between these two branches of higher education than any other. In particular, Akron president George F. Zook, appalled to discover that only eight of 25 large Ohio cities had any kind of college facilities, used his considerable influence (he would later become U. S. Commissioner of Education) to foster the junior college idea.[99] In 1927 the Association of Urban Universities wholeheartedly endorsed the junior college movement as compatible with its own interests.[100]

The idea of service faded away gradually throughout the twenties. Even though more cities would found four year municipal institutions in that decade than at any other time, the movement to organically tie the university and the community together had all but died. Save for a partial resurgence under very different terms in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the idea which generated so much interest during its heyday ceased to capture the popular imagination. The profound fragmentation, isolation, and alienation which emerged during the twenties established a style which would continue up to the present. The student unrest, departmental infighting, faculty-administration separateness, and lack of certainty is in its seventh decade. The answers seem no clearer now than they did then. Problems in communication and conceptualization remain. The bureaucratic retreat within explains no more than it satisfies. Other directedness creates more personal problems. Where it is all going is uncertain. Caught between the transient character of a peer group society and the ceaseless pain of future shock, perhaps a return to some of the stability of a service-oriented university is appealing. But, then, perhaps too we've outgrown our ancestors. Only people thinking beyond their own isolation can give us an answer. Let's hope it's the right one.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *U. C. Record: Commencement Exercises, June 1920* (Cincinnati: U. C., 1920), 8-9.

[2] *U. C. Record: The Service of the University to the Nation and the Annual Reports of Officers for 1918* (Cincinnati: U. C., 1918).

[3] Claude Charleton Bowman, *The College Professor in America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1938), 145-6.

[4] George W. Knepper, *New Lamps for Old: One Hundred Years of Urban Higher Education at the University of Akron* (Akron, 1970), 127-30; Frank R. Hickerson, "A History of the University of Toledo," D. Ed., University of Cincinnati, 1941, 319-20; Reginald C. McGrane, *The University of Cincinnati: A Success Story in Higher Education* (Cincinnati: The University of Cincinnati, 1963), 234-7; *The Cincinnatian, 1918* (Cincinnati: U. C., 1918), 222.

[5] R. McGrane, *ibid.*, 236-7.

[6] Thomas C. Cochran and William Miller, *The Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1943), 245.

[7] *A Century of Municipal Higher Education: A Collection of Addresses Delivered During the Centennial Observance of the University of Louisville, America's Oldest Municipal University* (Chicago: Lincoln Printing Co., 1937), 7.

[8] R. McGrane, *Univ. of Cinti.*, 243, 248.

[9] R. H. Eckelberry, *The History of the Municipal University in the United States* (Bulletin of the U. S. Office of Education, #2, 1932), 99.

[10] F. Hickerson, "Hist. of Univ. of Toledo," 438, 510.

[11] G. Knepper, *New Lamps for Old*, 121.

[12] R. Eckelberry, *Hist. of Municipal Univ. in U. S.*, 139-49.

[13] Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (N. Y. : Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), 179; Allen Bogue, *The Community College* (N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1950), 22.

[14] Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, *The Politics of Unreason* (N. Y.: Harper & Row, 1970), esp. p. 16.

[15] C. Bowman, *The College Prof. in Am.*, 107-8.

[16] Edward A. Ross, *Principles of Sociology* (N. Y.: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1938), 590.

[17] Quoted in Byron Lamar Johnson, *Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Glencoe Press, 1969), 9.

[18] Henry May, "Shifting Perspectives on the 1920s," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XLIII(1957), 425.

[19] June Axinn and Herman Levin, *Social Welfare: A History of the American Response to Need* (N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1975), 120.

[21] S. E. Forman, *The Rise of American Commerce and Industry* (N. Y.: Century, 1927), 369; U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960), 414.

[20] *Historical Statistics*, 139.

[22] T. Cochran & W. Miller, *Age of Enterprise*, 336-7; Stuart D. Brandes, *American Welfare Capitalism*, *1880-1940* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), inc.

[23] Frederick Lewis Allen, *The Lords of Creation* (N. Y.: Harper & Row, 1935), 222.

[24] Merle Curti and Roderick Nash, *Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education* (New Brunswick; N. J.: Ruthers University Press, 1965), 240.

[25] Lotus D. Coffman, "Responsibility of the Community to the University," *School and Society*, XV (1922), 730.

[26] M. Curti & R. Nash, *Philanthropy in Am. Higher Educ.*, 222.

[27] Compiled from Statistics of *Universities, Colleges and Professional Schools, 1927-28* (Washington, 1930, Bulletin of the U. S. Office of Educ. # 38), 79-82. See Charts # 12 and 13, "City-Controlled Institutions of Higher Education: Sources of Income, 1915-1916" and "1927-28" in Lyle Koehler, "Municipalities and Higher Education: A Financial and Historical Overview, 1826-1976," 85-6.

[28] M. Curti & R. Nash, *Philanthropy in Am. Higher Educ.*, 164.

[29] *Ibid.*, 164; R. McGrane, *Univ. of Cinti.*, 255-6,258.

[30] *The Association of Urban Universities Fifth Report*...(np, 1920), inc., esp. 65-71; T. Cochran & W. Miller, *Age of Enterprise*, 306.

[31] R. Eckleberry, *The History of Municipal Univ. in U. S.*, 186-7.

[32] H. W. Foght, "Work in the Municipal University of Wichita," *Seventh Annual Proceedings Assoc. of Urban Univ.* (1928), 55.

[33] R. McGrane, *Univ. of Cinti*, 254.

[34] R. Eckleberry, *The History of Municipal Univ. in U. S.*, 154, 162, 168.

[35] Seymour Martin Lipset, *Rebellion in the University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), 177.

[36] S. Willis Rudy, *The College of the City of New York: A History 1847-1947* (N. Y.: The City College Press, 1949), 380; R. McGrane, *Univ. of Cinti.*, 246-7.

[37] Murray G. Ross, *The University: The Anatomy of Academe* (N. Y.: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1976), 178; Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (N. Y.: Random House, 1962), 474.

[38] L. Coffman, "Responsibility of Community to Univ.," *School & Society*, XVI, 730-1.

[39] Quoted in Barry D. Karl, *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 100,

[40] John C. Higham, Leonard Krieger, and Felix Gilbert, *History* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965), 12.

[41] J. Axinn & H. Levin, *Social Eelfare*, 140-3.

[42] L. Cremin, The Transformation of the Am. School, 235.

[43] S. Lipset, Rebellion in the Univ., 455.

[44] Ibid., 175; C. Bowman, The College Prof. in Am., 129, 131.

[45] Bowman, 133.

[46] S. Lipset, 175.

[47] F. Rudolph, The Am. College & Univ., 449.

[48] H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds., From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (N. Y.: Oxford University Press, 1946), 243.

[49] S. Lipset, Rebellion in the Univ., 163, 167; R. McGrane, Univ. of Cinti., 261; G. Knepper, New Lamps for Old, 229-34, 374, 376; S. Rudy, College of City of N. Y., 405-11.

[50] Rudy, 409-32.

[51] F. Rudolph, The Am. College & Univ., 389; G. Knepper, New Lamps for Old, 239-42; R. McGrane, Univ. of Cinti., 261-6.

[52] M. Ross, The Univ., 82-5.

[53] J. C. Jarvie, The Revolution in Anthropology (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1964), 182.

[54] Harold Rugg, That Men May Understand (N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1941), 182.

[55] Tamotsu Shibutani, Society and Personality: An Interactionist Approach to Social Psychology (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1961), 14, 17.

[56] Harry Stack Sullivan, The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry, ed. by Helen Swick Perry and Mary Ladd Gawel (N. Y.: W. W. Norton & Co., 1953), xiii.

[57] S. Rudy, College of the City of N. Y., 357; L. Cremin, The Transformation of the Am. School, 240.

[58] H. Sullivan, Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry, 6.

[59] L. Cremin, 209.

[60] William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, The Polish Peasant in Europe and America (N. Y.: A. A. Knopf, 1927), II, 1,855.

[61] William Heard Kilpatrick, Source Book in the Philosophy of Education (np: np, 1926).

[62] F. Rudolph, The Am. College & Univ., 460.

[63] See John D. Wolcott, Bibliography of Research Studies in Education 1926-1927 (Bureau of Educ. Bull. # 22, Washington, 1929); E. L. Clark, "Family Background and College Success," School & Society, XXV (1927), 237-8.

[64] J. Jarvie, Rev. in Anthropology, 2-3, 12, 16.

[65] L. Cremin, Transformation of Am. School, 188.

[66] Raymond Walters, Statistics of Registration in American Universities and Colleges, 1931 (np: The Science Press, 1931).

[67] Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1929 (Washington: Govt. Printing Bureau, 1929), 13-6; Edward A. Filene, "Adult Education in the Modern Age," Adult Education, VII: Supplement (September 1931), 1-3.

[68] J. H. Easterby, A History of the College of Charleston Founded 1770 (N. Y.: Scribner's, 1935), 199.

[69] Otto Klineburg, "The Question og Negro Intelligence," Opportunity, IX (Dec. 1931), 366-7; Horace Mann Bond, "A Century of Negro Higher Education," in William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer, eds., A Century of Higher Education: Classical Citadel to Collegiate Colossus (N. Y.: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1962), 192.

[70] Chart # 5 in L. Koehler, "Municipalities and Highr Education," 72-4; Biennial Survey of Education 1926-1928 (Bulletin of U . S. Office of Education # 16, Washington, 1930), 759, 908.

[71] Bond, 190.

[72] Biennial Survey, 1926-8 , 759, 908.

[73] William John Cooper, "The Negro and Education," Bulletin of the National Association of Teachers in Colored Schools, XII (Dec. 1931), 15-6, 30.

[74] Quoted in Emory S. Bogardus, The Development of Social Thought(N. Y.: Longmans, Green & Co., 1957), 530.

[75] Statistics compiled from Biennial Survey of Education, 1926-8.

[76] R. McGrane, Univ. of Cinti., 253; J. Easterby, Hist. of College of Charleston, 192; Biennial Survey,1926-8, 204

[77] Leonard Vincent Koos, The Junior College (Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Educational Series # 5, Minneapolis, 1924), I, 68-9, 150-1.

[78] Ibid., I, 150.

[79] Ibid., I, 123, 138, 168.

[80] Walter Crosby Eels, The Junior College (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931), 218; Frederick Lamson Whitney, The Junior College in America (Colorado Teachers' College Educational Series, # 5, Greeley, 1928). 45; Koos, I, 129.

[81] Biennial Survey, 1926-8, 691.

[82] Elbert K. Fretwell, Founding Public Junior Colleges: Local Initiative in Six Communities (N. Y.: Teachers' College, Columbia Univ., 1954), 22; W. Eells, Junior College, 22; Biennial Surbey, 1926-8, 738, 744, 747.

[83] F. M. McDowell, The Junior College (Bulletin of Bureau of Educ. # 35, 1919), 52; Eels, 284, 287.

[84] Eells, 208.

[85] L. Koos, The Junior-College Movement (Boston: Ginn, 1925), 166, 181-5.

[86] A. F. Lange, "The Junior College as an Integral Part of the Public School System," School Review, XXV (1917), 475.

[87] Eells, 742-3.

[88] G. E. Stoddard, "The Articulation of High School and College Subject Matter," Schobl Executives Magazine, XLIX (1930), 356.

[89] Eells, 132.

[90] J. B. Johnston, "Adjusting College Education to the Individual," Journal of the National Education Association, XX (1931), 275-6.

[91] Charles H. Cooley, *Human Nature and and the Social Order* (N. Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922), 183-5; George Herbert Mead, cited in Charles W. Morris, ed., *Mind, Self, and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934), 152-63.

[92] Thomas R. Verny, *Inside Groups: A Practical Guide to Encounter and Group Therapy* (N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1975), 5.

[93] Aubrey H. Douglas, "Curriculum Determinants in the Junior College," in *Junior College Education: A Collection of Papers from the California Quarterly of Secondary Education* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), 5.

[94] S. Lipset, *Rebellion in the Univ.*, 150, 166.

[95] J. Ben-David, *American Higher Education: Directions Old and New* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 78-9.

[96] G. Knepper, *New Lamps for Old*, 156-7.

[97] F. Hickerson, "A Hist. of Univ. of Toledo," 453-4.

[98] *U. C. Record: Annual Reports for 1919 and Progress of the University in Fifteen Years, 1904 to 1919* (Cincinnati: U. C., 1919), 116, 130; *U. C. Record: The Service of the Univ. to the Nation*, 97; *U. C. Record: The Service of the University to the City and the Annual Reports of Officers for 1917* (Cincinnati: U. C., 1917), 73.

[99] W. Eels, *The Junior College*, 146.

[100] *The Association of Urban Universities, Fourteenth Annual Meeting*...(np, 1927), 82-3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Edith. "Education for Social Work." Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ended June 30, 1914. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1914, I:345-59.

Allen, Frederick Lewis. The Lords of Creation. N. Y.: Harper and Row, 1935.

American Universities and Colleges. Washington: American Council on Education, 1936.

The Association of Urban Universities, First to Fourteenth Annual Meetings. N. p.: Association of Urban Universities, 1916-27.

Axinn, June, and Levin, Herman. Social Welfare: A History of the American Response to Need. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1975.

Bailey, Henry Turner. Instruction in the Fine and Manual Arts in the United States: A Statistical Monograph. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 6, 1909:136-57.

Baker, Ray Stannard. Following the Color Line: American Negro Citizenship in the Progressive Era. N. Y.: Doubleday, Page, and Company, 1908.

Baskerville, Charles. "College of the City of New York, New York." In The University and the Municipality. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 38, 1915.

Ben-David, J. American Higher Education: Directions Old and New. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Blauch, L. E., and Bonner, H. R. Statistics of Normal Schools, 1917-1918. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 81, 1920.

Boas, Franz. Anthropology. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, 1908.

Bolton, Frederick E. "Some Probable Effects upon Higher Education Due to the Development of Junior Colleges." Educational Administration and Supervision 5 (1919):85-93.

Bogardus, Emory S. The Development of Social Thought. N. Y.: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1957.

Bogue, Allen. The Community College. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1950

Bond, Horace Mann. "A Century of Negro Higher Education." In A Century of Higher Education: Classical Citadel to Collegiate Colossus, edited by William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer, 190-92. N. Y.: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1962.

Bourne, Randolph. Youth and Life. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913.

Bowman, Claude Charleton. The College Professor in America. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938.

Broderick, Francis L., and Meier, August, eds. Negro Protest Thought in the Twentieth Century. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1965.

Brandes, Stuart D. American Welfare Capitalism, 1880-1940. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Brickman, William W., and Lehrer, Stanley, eds. A Century of Higher Education: Classical Citadel to Collegiate Colossus. N. Y.: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1962.

Bryce, James. The American Commonwealth. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1897.

Bureau of Education (later Office of Education). Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1929. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1929.

---------------. Report to the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1899-1900. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1901.

--------------. Reports to the Commissioner of Education for the Years Ended June 30, 1910 and June 30, 1911. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1911, 1912.

--------------, Statistical Division. Biennial Survey of Education, 1918-1920: Statistics. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1923.

-----------------------------. Biennial Survey of Education, 1926-1928. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1930.

-----------------------------. Summer Schools in 1918. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 31, 1919.

Burns, Arthur. The Decline of Competition. N. Y.: McGraw Hill, 1936.

Burris, William Paxton. "The Responsibility of a Municipal University in Relation to the City Schools." In The University and the Municipality. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 38, 1915.

Butler, Nicholas Murray, ed. Education in the United States: A Series of Monographs Prepared for the United States Exhibit at the Paris Exposition of 1900. Albany: J. B. Lyon Company, 1900.

Callahan, Raynond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Carter, Harold J., ed. Intellectual Foundations of American Education. N. Y.: Pittman Publishing Company, 1965.

A Century of Municipal Higher Education: A Collection of Addresses Delivered during the Centennial Observance of the University of Louisville, America's Oldest Municipal University. Chicago: Lincoln Printing Company, 1937.

The Cincinnatian, 1904-1919. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 1904-1919.

Clarke, Edward H. Sex in Education: Or, a Fair Chance for the Girls. Boston: Osgood, 1873.

Claxton, P. P. "Cooperative Methods in Education." In The University and the Municipality. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 38, 1915.

Cochran, Thomas C., and Miller, William. The Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1943.

"Coeducation of the Sexes in the United States." Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1900-1901, II: 1217-1315. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902.

Coffman, Lotus D. "Responsibility of the Community to the University." School and Society, 15 (1922).

"The College-Bred Negro." Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ended June 30, 1902, I:191-229. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1903.

Colvert, C. C. "A Half Century of Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, 17 (1947).

Cooley, Charles H. Human Nature and the Social Order. N. Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922.

Cooper, William John. "The Negro and Education." Bulletin of the National Association of Teachers in Colored Schools, 12 (December 1931):15-30.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957. N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

Curti, Merle, and Nash, Roderick. Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Education. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1965.

Curtis, H. S. "Inhibition." Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1900-1901, I: 345-356. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902.

Dabney, Charles William. "Memoir." Manuscript at Hampden-Sydney Library.

——————. The Municipal University. N. p.: n. p., 1914.

Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1916.

Douglas, Aubrey H. "Curriculum Determinants in the Junior College." Junior College Education: A Collection of Papers from the `California Quarterly of Secondary Education'. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

Easterby, J. H. A History of the College of Charleston Founded 1770. N. Y.: Scribner's, 1935.

Education for the Immigrant: Abstracts of Papers Read at a Public Conference under the Auspices of the New York-New Jersey Committee of the North American Civic League for Immigrants, Held at New York City, May 16 and 17, 1913. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 51, 1913.

Eels, Walter Crosby. The Junior College. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1931.

Eckelberry, R. H. The History of the Municipal University in the United States. Office of Education Bulletin No. 2, 1932.

Filene, Edward A. "Adult Education in the Modern Age." Adult Education, 7, Supplement (September 1931): 1-3.

Foght, H. W. "Work in the Municipal University of Wichita." Association of Urban Universities Fifteenth Annual Proceedings. N. p.: n. p., 1928.

Forman, S. E. The Rise of American Commerce and Industry. N. Y.: Century, 1927.

Fretwell, Albert K. Founding Public Junior Colleges: Local Initiative in Six Communities. N. Y.: Columbia University Teacher's College, 1954.

Fryer, John. Admission of Chinese Students to American Colleges. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 2, 1909.

Gerth, H. H., and Mills, C. Wright, eds. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. N. Y.: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Goldman, Eric F. Rendezvous With Destiny. N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952.

Griffith, Coleman. The Junior College in Illinois. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1945.

Haber, Samuel. Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Haeckel, Ernst. The Riddle of the Universe: At the Close of the Nineteenth Century. N. Y.: Harper and Row, 1901.

Hall, G. Stanley. Youth: Its Education, Regimen, and Hygiene. N. Y.: D. Appleton and Company, 1907.

Hickerson, Frank R. "A History of the University of Toledo." D. Ed. disser., University of Cincinnati, 1941.

Higham, John C.; Krieger, Leonard; and Gilbert, Felix. History. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Hillway, Tyrus. "Historical Development of the Junior and Community College." In A History of Higher Education: Classical Citadel to Collegiate Colossus, edited by William W. Bricker and Stanley Lehrer. N. Y.: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1962, pp. 110-23.

Hodge, Frederick Webb, ed. Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico. Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 30, 1912.

Hofstadter, Richard. Social Darwinism in American Thought. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.

————————, and Hardy, C. DeWitt. The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, 1952.

————————, and Metzger, W. P. The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, 1955.

Holliday, Carl. "The Municipal University." School and Society, 6 (1917): 426-31.

Hughes, R. J. "The Public Junior Colleges in Kansas." School Review, 38 (1930): 450-55.

Jackson, Henry E. The Community Center: What It Is and How to Organize It? Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 11, 1918.

James, George Wharton. *What the White Race May Learn from the Indian*. Chicago: Forbes and Company, 1908.

Jarvie, J. C. *The Revolution in Anthropology*. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1964.

Jenks, Jeremiah W. "New York University, New York." In *The University and the Municipality*. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 38, 1915.

Johnson, Byron Lamar. *Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College*. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969.

Johnston, J. B. "Adjusting College Education to the Individual." *Journal of the National Education Association*, 20 (1931):275-76.

Karl, Barry D. *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Kilpatrick, William Heard. *Source Book in the Philosophy of Education*. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1926.

Kirschner, Don S. "The Ambiguous Legacy: Social Justice and Social Control in the Progressive Era." *Historical Reflections*, 2 (1975):69-88.

Klineberg, Otto. "The Question of Negro Intelligence." *Opportunity*, 9 (December 1931):366-67.

Knepper, George W. *New Lamps for Old: One Hundred Years of Urban Higher Education at the University of Akron*. Akron: University of Akron, 1970.

Koehler, Lyle. "Municipalities and Higher Education: A Financial and Historical Overview, 1826-1976." Manuscript in University of Cincinnati Archives.

Koos, Leonard Vincent. *The Junior College*. Minneapolis: Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Educational Series No. 5, 1924.

-------------. *The Junior College Movement*. Boston: Ginn, 1925.

Lange, A. F. "The Junior College as an Integral Part of the Public School System." *School Review*, 25 (1917):465-79.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. *Rebellion in the University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

-------------, and Raab, Earl. *The Politics of Unreason*. N. Y.: Harper and Row, 1970.

Lovett, Robert Morss. "Education." In *Civilization in the United*

States: An Inquiry by Thirty Americans, edited by Harold E. Stearns. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1922, pp. 77-92.

Lowell, A. Laurence. What A University President Has Learned. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1938.

May, Henry. "Shifting Perspectives on the 1920s." Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 43 (1957):405-27.

McDougall, William. Introduction to Social Psychology. Boston: J. W. Luce and Company, 1909.

McDowell, F. M. The Junior College. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 35, 1919.

McGrane, Reginald C. The University of Cincinnati: A Success Story in Higher Education. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 1963.

Miller, Kelly. "The Education of the Negro." Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1900-1901, I, pp. 788-841. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902.

Morris, Charles W., ed. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1934.

Negro Education: A Study of the Private and Public High Schools for Colored People in the United States. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 38, 1916.

Padover, Saul K., ed. Wilson's Ideals. Washington: American Council on Public Affairs, 1942.

Palinchak, Robert. The Evolution of the Community College. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1973.

Patterson, John L. "Municipal Universities of the United States." National Municipal Review, 5 (1916):553-64.

Reber, Louis E. University Extension in the United States. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 19, 1914.

Riesman, David, with Nathan Glazer and Reuel Denny. The Lonely Crowd. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Robinson, Mabel Louise. The Curriculum of the Woman's College. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 6, 1918.

Ross, Edward A. Principles of Sociology. N. Y.: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938.

------------. Social Psychology. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1909.

Ross, Murray G. The University: The Anatomy of Academe. N. Y.: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1976.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. N. Y.: Random House, 1962.

Rudy, Willis. The College of the City of New York: A History, 1847-1947. N. Y.: College Press, 1949.

Rugg, Harold. That Men May Understand. N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran and Company, 1941.

Schmidt, George P. "A Century of the Liberal Arts College." In A Century of Higher Education: Classic Citadel to Collegiate Colossus, edited by William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer. N. Y.: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1962, pp. 50-66.

Schenkel, Walter. "Who Has Been in Power?" In Power and Authority, edited by Harold L. Hodgkinson and L. Richard Meeth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971, pp. 1-24.

Shibutani, Tamotsu. Society and Personality: An Interactionist Approach. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1961.

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in Black and White. N. Y.: Random House, 1964.

Smith, Anna Tolman. "Coeducation in Schools and Colleges of the United States." Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ended June 30, 1903, I, pp. 1064-74. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904.

Spaulding, Frank E.; Burris, Willaim Paxton; and Elliott, Edward C. The Aims, Scope, and Methods of a University Course in Public School Administration. Iowa City: National Society of College Teachers of Education, 1910.

Stoddard, G. E. "The Articulation of High School and College Subject Matter." School Executives Magazine, 49 (1930).

Sullivan, Harry Stack. The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry, edited by Helen Swick Perry and Mary Ladd Gawel. N. Y.: W. W. Norton and Company, 1953.

Taylor, Frederick. Principles of Scientific Management. N. Y.: Harper's, 1911.

Thomas, William I., and Znaniecki, Florian. The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. N. Y.: A. A. Knopf, 1927.
Thorndike, Edward Lee. Educational Psychology. N. Y.: Columbia University Teacher's College, 1903.

True, Alfred Charles. A History of Agricultural Experimentation and Research in the United States, 1607-1925.... Washington:

Department of Agriculture, 1937.

Universities, Colleges and Professional Schools, 1927-28. Office of Education Bulletin No. 38, 1930.

University of Cincinnati Record: Annual Reports for 1919 and Progress of the University in Fifteen Years, 1904 to 1919. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 1919.

University of Cincinnati Record: Commencement Exercises, June 1914 and June 1920. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 1914, 1920.

University of Cincinnati Record: Condition and History of the University in 1912, Including a Sociological Study of the Student Body. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 1912.

University of Cincinnati Record: The Service of the University to the City and Annual Reports of Officers for 1915, 1916, 1917. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 1915, 1916, 1917.

University of Cincinnati Record: The Service of the University to the Nation and the Annual Reports of Officers for 1918. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 1918.

United States Bureau of the Census. Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

------------------. Thirteenth Census of the United States, Taken in the Year 1910: Population IV. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1914.

United States Commission on Industrial Relations. Final Report. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1915.

Veblen, Thorstein. The Theory of the Leisure Class. N. Y.: New American Library, 1963 (first published 1899).

Verney, Thomas R. Inside Groups: A Practical Guide to Encounter and Group Therapy. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Watson, John Broadus. Behavior: An Introduction to Comparative Psychology. N. Y.: Holt, 1914.

Welter, Rush. Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, 1962.

Wheaton, H. H. "Recent Progress in the Education of Immigrants." Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year Ended June 30, 1914, I:425-54. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1915.

Whitney, Frederick Lamson. *The Junior College in America*. Greeley: Colorado Teachers College Educational Series No. 5, 1928.

Wilson, Woodrow. *The New Freedom*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1916.

Wolcott, Raymond. *Statistics of Registration in American Universities and Colleges, 1931*. N. p.: The Science Press, 1931.

Woodson, Carter Goodwin, and Wesley, Charles E. *The Negro in American History*. N. p.: Associated Publishers, Inc., 1972.

Woodward, C. Vann. *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*. N. Y.: Oxford University Press, 1957.